

**BX**  
**5055**  
**SG15**


UC-NRLF



\$B 467 445

ALBERT  
LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA









**STRICTURES**

**ON THE**

**POET LAUREATE'S**

**“BOOK OF THE CHURCH.”**

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



# STRICTURES

ON THE

POET LAUREATE'S

“Book of the Church.”

---

Omnia transformat sese in miracula rerum.

VIRG. G. IV.

---

By JOHN MERLIN.

*Milner, John*

---

---

LONDON:

Printed by and for KEATING and BROWN, 38, Duke Street, Grosvenor Square, and 9, Ivy Lane, Paternoster Row; sold also by J. BOOKER, A. CUDDON, W. ANDREWS, and SHERWOOD and JONES.  
And by R. COYNE, 4, Capel Street, DUBLIN.

---

1824.

LOAN STAGE 1

BX5055

S615

## STRICTURES

ON

## "THE BOOK OF THE CHURCH."

A DEGREE of enthusiasm is requisite to constitute the character of a Poet ; but no quality is more at variance with it than religious fanaticism. This confuses the imagination, misleads the judgment, and hardens the heart ; in so much, that a man of real genius and talents for the Muses, on falling into this fanaticism, would be found too dull in his compositions to gain for them a patient reading. Such have been the late aberrations of our Laureat's mind. After writing D'Esperilla's Letters in commendation of the Catholic Religion, and Wat Tyler's Drama, to excite popular tumults against Government, he has latterly celebrated and recommended the chief and most dangerous schismatics from the Establishment, the Wesleys, Whitfields, and their associates ; and now, in the frantic style, and with the lying memorials of another such schismatic, John Fox, he

B

raves, through the history of many centuries, in abusing and calumniating the common source of Christianity, in order to court the heads of the present Establishment, under pretence of vindicating it.

Mr. Southey, it has been stated, is a Poet ; that is, as the original Greek word signifies, a *maker* or *inventor*. Hence we are not to be surprised if he makes use of his poetical licence or faculty in writing history, rather than weary himself in hunting out and bringing forward dusty records for the many extraordinary things he describes and tells. It is true, he says, he “ can “ refer to authorities for them among his col- “ lections,” but that he does not give these, “ because the scale of his work is not one which “ would require or justify a display of re- “ search.” But it may be truly said of the case in question : *De non apparentibus et de non existentibus eadem est ratio* : on the other hand, his tedious quotations from John Fox, and other writers of John Fox’s standard, prove that he has not been sparing of ink or paper. While the Poet confines himself to the mythology of the Britons, Saxons, and Danes, no one can feel an interest in investigating his authorities ; but when he indulges his fancy with the truths of Revelation, or facts connected with those truths, he ought

to be dragged down to the solid ground of authentic documents.

Speaking of the first conversion of this Island to Christianity by the envoys of Pope Eleutherius, under the subordinate British King, Lucius, he says that "it rests on legends of doubtful authority," and yet it is recorded by every writer of character, who treats of the matter, whether British, Saxon, or Roman, whether Protestant or Catholic, from Nennius down to Parker, Godwin, and Usher; nor can any motive be assigned for his affected doubts on the subject, except his unwillingness to ascribe so great a benefit, as the conversion of the Britons, to the See of Rome. The conversion, however, of our immediate ancestors, the Anglo-Saxons, together with their civilization and instruction in literature and the useful arts, by monks sent from Rome on the part of Pope St. Gregory, is a fact too notorious to be called in question by him. But he takes care to suppress two other facts of the greatest importance in the present case, though acknowledged by Bale, the Centuriators, and other learned Protestants; namely, that the Apostles of our ancestors, these envoys from Pope Gregory, brought along with them from Rome, the same Christianity which is professed in it at the present day;

namely, the Mass, the Real Presence, the Supremacy of the Pope, Prayers to the Saints and for the Dead, Relicks, Crucifixes, and Holy Water. The second fact is, that the Roman Missionaries arriving here, at the end of the sixth century, found the Britons or Welsh, who had been converted in the second century, professing the self-same religion with themselves. For had it been otherwise, these Roman Missionaries never would have allowed, much less have required them, as St. Augustine of Canterbury did, to join with him and his companions in converting the remaining Pagan Saxons. This important fact is further confirmed by the previous missions of St. Germanus, Lupus, and Severus, continental Bishops, in communion with, and deriving their authority from the Pope, who, nevertheless, when they visited the Christian Britons above a century before the arrival of St. Augustine, confined their efforts to the extirpation of the Pelagian heresy. In vain do many Protestants harp on the difference that was found in the British and the Roman computation of Easter Day, since every one sees that this regarded a mere secondary point of discipline, not the essential points of Religion. In vain also do some others alledge that the Britons would not receive St. Augustine for

their Archbishop; in fact, he neither claimed to be such, nor would the maintenance of their ancient Sees, on the part of the Britons, have proved in any sort their Religion to have been different from that of Rome. It is then a mere fiction of the Poet, that the faith of the Welsh was “purer than that of the Christian Saxons,” as is also the assertion that the Apostles of the latter “were little scrupulous concerning the measures they employed, being persuaded that any measures were justifiable, if they conduced to bring about the good end which was their aim.”

It is of little consequence noticing the author's errors that are not of a practical tendency, as when he says, “there was but one Pope Gregory, besides the one who is deservedly styled the *Great*, distinguished by the rank of *Saint*,” and when he calls St. Benedict, who was of a noble family, and had received a learned education in the schools of Rome, “*an Italian peasant* ;” but when he commends the Primate Theodore for having, as he expresses it, “prohibited divorce for any other cause than the one which is allowed by the Gospel,” p. 81, he falsifies a synodical decree, in order to decide an important controversy between Catholics and Protestants. It is false,

then, that Theodore, or rather the Council of Herudford, over which he presided, mentioned, or so much as alluded to the unlawful practice of *divorce*. What it decreed is the same that the Catholic Church has taught in every age and country; namely, that “no one is to leave his wife unless as the Gospel teaches, on account of fornication. But if any one shall have expelled his wife, let him *marry no other*, but remain as he is, or be reconciled to his own wife.”\*

Mr. Southey, indeed, attributes merit to the Catholic Clergy for building churches, and getting them endowed with rates, and glebes, and tithes; benefits which descend to his present clients, who most assuredly would never have gained them from the religious feelings of their contemporary laity; in other respects he hardly ever speaks of them, but to charge them with the grossest ignorance, superstition, and religious corruptions—charges which cost nothing to advance. He goes so far as even to advance that “Christianity, in the days of

\* Nullus conjugem propriam, nisi ut Sanctum Evangelium docet fornicationis causa relinquet. Quod si quisquam propriam expulerit conjugem—nulli alteri copuletur, sed ita permaneat, aut propriæ reconcilietur conjugii. Concil. Herud. A.D. 673. Spelman Concil. p. 153.



“Dunstan, was as much a system of priest-craft as that which, at the present day, prevails in Hindostan and Tibet.” It is true the wide-wasting ravages of the barbarous Danes were a great obstacle to the progress of literature, which the clergy, and particularly the monks, during the middle ages, ever cultivated and promoted; but the very names of a Bede, an Aldhelm, an Alcuin, and an Ingulph, with those of a hundred other scholars who might be named, together with the existing decrees of the councils held in those times, prove that there was much more learning and cultivated genius in them than superficial moderns are willing to allow. As to the charge of superstition and the corruption of Christianity, it is what every sect of modern reformers brings against the others who have not advanced so far as themselves in the career of irreligion. The Presbyterians accuse the Church of England of numerous superstitious and corruptions. The Baptists bring the same charge against the Calvinists for baptizing mere infants, as the Quakers do against all other denominations, for baptizing persons at all. So things must be till the end of time, and Christ must blasphemously be said not to have provided for the peace and truth of his Church, unless we

admit that he has left a faculty and an authority in it to pronounce what is, and what is not superstition and corruption. Appealing then to the unerring decisions of this living tribunal, we know and are sure that the Real Presence, for example, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Confession of Sins, and Prayers for the Dead, and the other doctrines and practices of the Catholics, which we otherwise prove to have come down to us from the Apostles, are not corruptions, but constituent parts of genuine Christianity.\*

I have been speaking of the avowed doctrine and practices of the Church, which are known by her Councils and authorized publications, such as the *Pastoral* of St. Gregory, the *Sum* of St. Thomas, and *The Following of Christ*, by à Kempis, not by the particular facts or opinions of individuals, much less by the dreams of mere legendary writers, and still less by the bigotted fictions of modern Protestants. Let Mr. Southey make out his charge from the authorities here referred to, if he can; in the mean time I wish to ask him what he would say or think of the honesty of a Catholic writer, who, giving an

\* See all this proved in Bellarmine's *Controversies*, in Hawarden's *True Church of Christ*, in *The End of Controversy*, and other works of the same description.

account of the state of the English Church in the last century, was to assert, on the authority of his late *Life of Wesley*, that its clergy believed themselves to have power over the elements, and even the celestial spirits;\* that they taught their hearers to lay aside prayer and good works; and to believe themselves free from every law human and divine,† and professedly worked them up to paroxysms of frantic madness, or utter despair.‡

The name of St. Dunstan, to whom the promotion of the superstitions and corruptions in question is more particularly attributed, has been disgraced by his biographers in the visionary scenes in which they have involved him. This has been the fate of other the most illustrious characters: Pope Silvester II. and Friar Bacon, because they so much excelled their cotemporaries in Chemistry and Mathematics, and produced such then unknown physical effects, were reported to deal with the devil. At

\* The Rev. G. Whitfield believed that the angel Gabriel attended on his congregation; accordingly he pretended to call him back as he was ascending to heaven, in order to bear a particular message, thus: *Stop, Gabriel! stop!*—*Wesley's Life*, vol. ii. p. 239.

† See Southey's Account of the Moravians, whose fundamental fanaticism of instantaneous conversion he himself avows.—*Vol. i. p. 159.*

‡ See the account of Messrs. Berridge, Hicks, &c. regular clergymen.—*Vol. ii. c. 24.*

all events, St. Dunstan's unquestionable talents and actions made him by far the first character of his age. Besides being an illustrious ascetic, a restorer of clerical and monastic discipline, and a model of prelatic virtues, he was a learned scholar, an exquisite mechanic in the most delicate kinds of works, a complete musician, and, what was of most consequence to his king and country, an accomplished Statesman and Prime Minister. Before and after his time, as is well known, the kingdom was over-run and laid waste by the Northern pirates ; whereas, by his wise measures, and particularly by his keeping a well-provided fleet on each of our three coasts, his pupil Edgar kept them in peace and order, without a battle, during the whole of his reign ; and in proof of his sovereignty, he obliged eight of their kings, in quality of his boatmen, to row him in state down the river Dee. The former qualities, however, among those mentioned above, were sure to draw down on this illustrious character the obloquy and calumnies of modern infidel and Protestant historians. John Fox, and Carte and Hume had broached them, but Mr. Southey has enlarged them and set them off with his fanciful decorations. I can only here take notice of the weightier of these charges. He is accused then of tearing away King Edwy

from his wife by brutal force, on the day of this Prince's coronation. The truth is, the woman was not his wife, but his near relation,\* and the wife of one of his Thanes. The fact of her not being his wife, but an infamous prostitute, is testified by all ancient authors : Malmsbury, Huntingdon, Wallingford, Gervase, Brompton, Higden, &c. ;† and the conduct of the royal youth, not then fourteen years of age, was such as could not be tolerated by Christians or civilized men in any age or country. Leaving his Thanes and Bishops who were assembled to do him honour, he betook himself to the company of that abandoned woman, and her equally guilty daughter, and was found by his kinsman, the Bishop of Litchfield, Kinsey, and his tutor Dunstan, then Abbot of Glastonbury, whom the Thanes had deputed to expostulate with him, in a situation that was an outrage to public morality, as well as to the kingly dignity.‡ None but the profligate

\* W. Malmsbury.

† Brompton.

‡ “ Invenerunt coronam de capite ejus,—et ipsum medium inter duas, matrem Ethelgivam nomine, et filiam, alternatim eas lascive,—Coronam capiti imponentes potius invitum quam voluntarium reduxerunt. Chronica Wallingford apud Galo.”—p. 542. “ Ipso die quo (*Edwinus*) in regem sacratus fuerat frequentissimo consessu procerum, dum de rebus seriis et regno necessariis inter eos ageretur e medio quasi ludibundus prorupit et in complexum ganæ devolutus, &c.”—Gul. Malm. de Gest. Reg. l. ii. c. 7.

youth's enemies, who sought his ruin, which, in fact, soon after followed, could connive at such scenes. That the Primate Odo pronounced between Edwy and Elgiva, whom he believed to have been never married together, and that he caused a sentence of divorce—the former to be dethroned, and the latter to be put to death, are circumstances utterly destitute of historical authority, and mere fictions of the Poet.

Another of Mr. Southey's alleged corruptions of the Church in the time of S. Dunstan, and for which he brings him in as particularly guilty, was the enforcing of clerical celibacy. He says that “nothing in ecclesiastical history is more  
“ certain than that no such obligation was im-  
“ posed during the three first centuries, and  
“ that the Scripture affords not the slightest  
“ pretext for it.” Let the great Origen, who flourished at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third, speak to these points. He says: “It belongs to him alone  
“ to offer up the never failing sacrifice, who  
“ has devoted himself to a never failing and  
“ perpetual chastity.”\* To the same effect Venerable Bede observes: “In the old law,  
“ priests were required to be continent during  
“ the stated times of their ministry : but now an

\* Hom. 23 in Num.

“ injunction is laid upon priests to observe  
 “ chastity continually, and ever to abstain from  
 “ the use of marriage, that they may always  
 “ assist at the altar.”\* St. Jerom testifies, that in  
 the three great Patriarchates namely Rome,  
 Alexandria, and Antioch, no persons were re-  
 ceived among the clergy but such as were sin-  
 gle, or who had separated themselves from their  
 wives.† The tragical event of the assembly at  
 Calne in Wiltshire, where Beornelm, and his  
 party, arguing for clerical marriages, the beams  
 of the room on which they rested gave way, and  
 they were killed or maimed by the fall ; while  
 the beam which supported St. Dunstan remain-  
 ing firm, he escaped unhurt : this is ascribed  
 by Mr. Southey and modern Protestants to a  
 malicious contrivance of the Primate, while their  
 predecessors, John Fox and the Lutheran Cen-  
 turiators, attributed it to his skill in magic.

Passing on to the Norman period, the Poet  
 aims many mortal stabs at his mother Church,  
 through the sides of her sainted Pontiff Gre-  
 gory VII., and our learned Primate, St. Anselm.  
 The former he calls “ a restless spirit who has

\* Expos. c. 1, Luc.

† Advers. Vigilant St. Epiphanius testifies to the same effect.  
 —Hores. 59. See Concil. Eliber. can. 33. 2. Conc. Carthag.  
 can. 2. Concil. Nicen. can. 3. 2. Conc. Arelat. can. 2.

“obtained an opprobrious renown in history ;” while equitable judges, who are possessed of the genuine spirit of Christianity, pronounce, that he has acquired glory to himself for time and eternity, by extirpating that system of simony and that wide spreading incontinency, which undermined the sanctity of the Church at the time in which he lived. The book-maker admits that it was a right thing to oppose simony, though practised by Kings and Emperors, as it certainly was at that period, to a scandalous degree ;\* but he ridicules the claim of the Church to be “the door of the sheep-fold,” that is, to claim an exclusive power of granting spiritual investitures, or the divine jurisdiction necessary for Bishops and Priests to administer the sacraments and the word of God to their respective flocks. This arises from the Poet’s ignorance of the matter, and from the utter want of such jurisdiction, in the Church to which he professes to belong. The Catholic Church, however, has at all times, been equally jealous of her jurisdiction and her doctrine, and therefore when she found that temporal Princes fancied, that by conferring the temporalities of a

\* “*Dei ecclesias expilavit (Rex) et Episcopatus, Abbatiasque sive pretio vendidit, sive sua possessione retinuit atque elocavit.*”—*Sax. Chron. A. D. 1100.*



Bishopric, for example, they really gave jurisdiction and made the Bishop, and insisted on conferring the same by the ecclesiastical emblems of jurisdiction and faith, *the crosier and the ring*, the Church necessarily condemned the usage. In this decision the temporal Princes at length acquiesced, contenting themselves with their Prelates swearing fealty to them and doing homage for their temporal possessions. St. Anselm's cause was precisely the same as the Pope's in this respect, and is quite distinct from the latter's claim of pronouncing when Princes, by their misconduct had forfeited their right to the obedience of their subjects : a claim which has at all times and in all countries been denied and withstood, and this, without the reproof of the Pontiff himself, by the most orthodox and conscientious Catholics.

But it is on the celebrated champion of the Church, St. Thomas Becket, that the Poet more copiously discharges his bile. To this end, contracted as he says his scale is, he devotes a hundred pages of his first volume. Nevertheless, by distinguishing the three different stages of the Primate's contention with his King, it is possible to give a succinct yet clear account of the whole matter. In the first of these stages then, the question was about the exemption

of the clergy from the jurisdiction of civil tribunals. The origin of this was not such as is described by Mr. Southey, but arose from the special grants of Constantine, Valentinian and other Christian Emperors, who thought it better that the legal offences of clergymen, when they occurred, should be judged and punished privately by their Bishops, than that an order of men should be degraded whose reputation was so essentially connected with that of morality and Religion. This part of the public law, with the other parts of it, and with literature itself, was introduced among our unlettered ancestors, by their Christian Apostles, and, at the time we are speaking of, was the undoubted law of the land. This being so, was it not the Primate's duty to maintain the exemption rather than sell it for his own personal advantage, as some of his cotemporary Prelates did; especially when he knew to what lengths of injustice and cruelty the King's unbounded anger was capable of driving him? And shall those moderns who applaud Primate Langton for asserting this, among the other privileges of the clergy, in the first article of *Magna Charta*, sword in hand, condemn St. Thomas Becket for claiming it in a peaceable and legal manner?—The second of these stages regarded the Constitu-

tions of Clarendon which, under the false name of *ancient usages*, were recent inventions concerted by the flatterers of Henry, not only for the destruction of those and the other privileges of the clergy, but also for the subjugation and oppression of the Catholic Religion itself, then the sworn Religion of England. In proof of this, it is sufficient to refer to the seventh of these new invented articles, which goes to take the most important department of spiritual jurisdiction out of the hands of the Bishops, and to place it in the hands of the King and his civil ministers.\* A Thomas Cranmer, indeed, would, in these circumstances, have surrendered the divine jurisdiction of the Church, but not a conscientious Catholic Bishop.—The third scene of the contest was one of a pure, unmixed ecclesiastical nature: two of the Primates suffragan Bishops, those of London and Salisbury, had concurred in the invasion of the rights of his Metropolitcal See by the coronation of the young King, in his province and in his despight. It was his unquestionable duty to maintain the rights of the archbishopric and the discipline of the

\* “ Nullus qui de Rege tenet in capite, nec aliquis Dominicorum ministrorum ejus excommunicatur, nec alicujus eorum terræ, sub interdicto ponatur nisi prius D. Rex, si in regno fuerit, conveniatur vel justiciarius ejus, si fuerit extra regnum, &c.”—Mat. Paris, A. D. 1161.

English Church : accordingly, he excommunicated those suffragans, till they should acknowledge their fault. Instead of their doing this, four armed ruffians rush forward, and with uplifted swords, require the Primate, then officiating in his Cathedral, to absolve the censured Prelates : he meekly answers, “ *They have given no satisfaction.*”—“ *Then you shall die,*” they fiercely exclaimed.—“ *I am ready to die,*” is his answer, “ *in the cause of God and his Church,*” at the same time bowing his head to their murderous weapons.

What civil judge, that had been assassinated in his court for refusing to let armed ruffians take the law into their own hands, would not have been immortalized by all good men ? By the same rule the Church is never more clearly justified in the language of her Liturgy, than when she prays as follows : “ *Oh God ! for whose Church the glorious Pontiff, Thomas, died by the swords of the impious,*” &c.

Preparing now to bring on the stage characters widely different from those of the Saints and Martyrs of past ages, the Poet exhibits the most hideous caricature of the religion of the latter, that his imagination can frame, under the title of *A View of the Papal System*. In this chapter, and in other parts of his book, he works up every legendary tale and every

vulgar superstition into an avowed doctrine or a practice of the Catholic Church ! and yet he has before his eyes the canons and decrees of the numerous Councils that were held in the ages he refers to, as likewise the voluminous works of the great St. Bernard, the acknowledged light of his age, the books of the *Master of Sentences*, Peter Lombard, which were commented upon by all the doctors, and the *Summa Theologiæ* of St. Thomas of Aquin, which was studied by all the divines of his own and succeeding ages. From these sources, if he meant to combat the Catholic Religion honourably and conscientiously, and not from his own imagination and such collections as he is afraid to bring forward, he would have drawn the articles he meant to impugn and ridicule.\* The learned reader will form some idea of the Poet's collection and of his learning from his affirming that “ the Popes

\* In proof that the Catholics had transferred their worship of Christ to the martyr Becket, he mentions that the offerings at the altar of the latter in Canterbury Cathedral at a certain time, were found to be of great value, while nothing at all was given at Christ's altar. With equal justice might a Catholic argue, that the Protestants of London prefer poor Byrne to Christ, because they have lately subscribed a large sum for this victim of the infamous Bishop Joscelyn's perjury, and not a shilling to Christ-Church Hospital in their city.

“ long hesitated to sanction what he calls the  
“ corruption of Transubstantiation, and that  
“ Hildebrand, S. Gregory VII, not only in-  
“ clined to the opinion of Berenger, by whom  
“ it was opposed, but pretended to consult the  
“ Virgin Mary, and then declared that she had  
“ pronounced against it !” The Poet pretends  
to account for the reception of this doctrine,  
and that of the sacrifice connected with it, by  
the Church of Rome, but he never thinks of  
explaining how the several Churches of Greece,  
Russia, Armenia and Ethiopia, nor how the  
Nestorians and Eutychians, who had been in  
open opposition to the Roman Church for so  
many centuries before the period in question,  
came to adopt the same alleged corruptions.  
The same argument holds good with respect to  
invoking the prayers of the Saints, venerating  
their remains, the confession of sins, praying  
for the dead, and the other Catholic tenets and  
practices ; all which the Poet first misrepresents  
and then ridicules.\* If his object be to raise a  
no-popery persecution, as his hero Wesley did in  
1780, he goes the ready way to effect it : but,  
if it be to withdraw the members of the Church  
of eighteen centuries from her communion,  
experience proves that he will utterly fail, as  
they are conscious of believing in a Religion

\* See a detailed refutation of them in the *End of Controversy*.

the reverse of what he represents it to be. On the other hand, many upright members of his own communion, on discovering the utter falsehood of his charges against her, as so many others have already done, will not hesitate to throw themselves into her bosom. Nothing so easy as to calumniate. Accordingly the Poet, by a fiction of his own, says, “ the corrupt lives  
“ of the clergy provoked inquiry into their doc-  
“ trine, and caused the first Reformers, meaning  
“ the Wickliffites and Hussites, to fraternize with  
“ the inhabitants of the Alpine and Pyrenean  
“ countries, who,” he says, “ had preserved the  
“ truth of better ages,” meaning, the obscene Manicheans, called Albigenses, and the seditious fanatics, the Vaudois. But will even Mr. Southey venture to compare, in point of Christian morality and piety, a Peter Bruys with his great opponent St. Bernard? a Tanchelin with St. Norbert? or a Wickliffe, with his enemy William of Wykeham? Will he compare Thomas Cranmer with Sir Thomas More? or Ann Boleyn with Catharine of Arragon? or Queen Elizabeth with the Queen of Scots? Conscious that no miracles have ever illustrated any other church than that to which its Divine founder promised a continuation of them,\* the Poet on every occasion treats these supernatural

\* Mark xvi. 17. John xiv. 12.

events, however strongly attested, as refuted impostures. He is particularly indignant at the stigmata of the devout contemplative St. Francis, which, though witnessed by numerous persons of the highest credit, he, on his own personal credit, pronounces to be “atrocious effrontery and blasphemous impiety.” Referring afterwards to a book called, *The Conformities of St. Francis with Christ*, which he knows was condemned by the Church, he also quotes at considerable length, another absurd legend, *The Eternal Gospel*, in order to render the Church odious and ridiculous ; at the same time that he himself acknowledges it to have been condemned by her.

The Poet begins his account of the noted John Wickliffe with saying, “The Roman Church has stigmatized him as a heretic of the first class ; but England and the Protestant world, while there is any virtue, while there is any praise, will regard him with veneration and gratitude.” He ends his panegyric with pronouncing of him as follows : “A great and admirable man he was ; his fame, high as it is, is not above his deserts ; and it suffers no abatement upon comparison with the most illustrious of those who have followed in the path which he opened.” In the mean time, though he pursues the history



of this innovator through a detail of fourteen pages, he never acquaints his readers with the particulars of his new doctrines, further than that he denied Transubstantiation and the Pope's Supremacy, which other heretics and scholastics of his description had done some centuries before him. Is it not plain then that the Poet is ashamed of his hero, and afraid to exhibit him in his natural shape? To say nothing then of Wickliffe's speculative errors, he was condemned by a Synod of eight Bishops and near forty Doctors, held in London, of holding the following seditious no less than impious doctrines, that “no Bishop or Priest, being in mortal sin, “can ordain, consecrate, or baptize;—that it is “contrary to holy scripture for ecclesiastics to “hold temporal property;—that no one is a “temporal Lord, or a Bishop, while he is in “mortal sin;—that temporal Lords can at “their pleasure take away any temporal possessions from ecclesiastics who are habitual “sinners, and that the people can punish, at “their discretion, their masters who act “wrong;—that tythes are mere alms, which “the parishioners may hold or give to others “by reason of the sins of their curates.”\*

It is worth while inquiring whether the dig-

\* See Labbe's Council, t. ix. p. ii. p. 2058; also Walsingham Historia, edit. Gul Camden, and Harpsfield's His. Wicliffiana.

nitaries, whose favour the Poet courts, will echo back his applause of this forerunner of the Anabaptists, and Regicides. Regardless, however, of the consequences that might follow from this levelling system, and unappalled by those which did immediately follow it, when a frantic rebellion, headed by Wat Tyler,\* and guided by the Wickliffite priest, John Ball,† beheaded the King's Chancellor, Archbishop Sudbury, and his Treasurer, Robert de Hales, and when even they raised their swords over his, their Monarch's head, our Poet goes on to celebrate as—martyrs all who suffered death in this cause, whatever their guilt might otherwise be; We might sympathize with him at the execution of the fanatic Sawtry, who would worship a saint, because Christ took human flesh, but not an angel. When, however, he canonizes the daring enthusiastic rebel, Sir John Oldcastle, merely because he impugned some articles of the established Religion, he betrays both the Church

\* Mr. Southey has celebrated this fatal rebellion, and held it up to the imitation of the radical levellers, particularly in the speeches of the Wickliffite priest, John Ball, in his dramatic poem of Wat Tyler, one of his best publications.

† Knighton expressly states that Ball was a disciple of Wickliffe. Indeed his sermon on Blackheath proves him to have been one. Jack Straw, who had murdered the Chancellor, confessed at his death, that his party had resolved to put all noblemen and gentlemen to death, and dispossess all clergymen of their property, leaving the begging friars to supply their place.—Walsing.

and the Government, which he professes to support. Sir John was surprized and taken with a large party of his Lollard adherents, at the time and place he had, by proclamation, appointed for the commencement of his rebellion, by our glorious Henry V., and was convicted and condemned in open Parliament. He was afterwards hanged with an iron collar round his neck, and then burnt, after conjuring Sir T. Erpingham, there present, to obtain a toleration for his sect, in case he should see him rise to life on the third day after his execution.\* The Poet proceeds with his list of rebel martyrs, but says nothing of Oldcastle's fellow captain, Sir Roger Acton, who was with him at the rendezvous in St. Giles's-fields; nor of William Murle, the maltman, who came thither with two horses richly caparisoned and a pair of gilt spurs, expecting to be knighted on the field by the new king, Sir John Oldcastle; nor of William Claydon, the currier, who, though he was so ignorant as to be unable to read, undertook to ordain his son a priest, and to make him say mass, all of whom suffered death on this occasion.

Having finished the first Volume of his *Book of the Church*, with the execution of the Fana-

\* Walsing.

tics and Rebels who suffered under the Plantagenets. Mr. Southey, very early in his Second Volume, resumes his favourite subject, with an account of persons of the same description who were put to death under the first Tudors. It is evident that his motive for often repeating this subject, and dwelling so much upon it, is to excite the feelings of the Protestant public against their Catholic fellow subjects, knowing well that no other is so directly calculated for this purpose. Candour, however, should have led him to observe that the laws, under which the Protestants suffered, were not made against them, but against the Albigenian Manichees, who were monsters of impiety and immorality, rather than heretics; that if those horrible laws were employed against Protestants, it was from a foresight of the civil commotions and bloodshed which would arise from any attempts to change the established religion; finally, that the Catholic Religion, so far from requiring sanguinary punishments, forbids her clergy, at least, under severe penalties, to take part in them, on any pretext whatsoever. The Poet's authority for the whole of his martyrology is that of the lying Puritan John Fox, whom he repeatedly calls *Good Fox*, but whose notorious falsehoods have been repeatedly exposed, and

sometimes even in Courts of Justice,\* and who himself was the advocate of the most perfidious murder committed in hatred of the Catholic Religion, upon record.†

The first of Mr. Southey's martyrs under Henry VIII. is Thomas Bilney, who, in more than thirty points out of thirty-four, on which he was examined, according to Fox himself, gave orthodox Catholic answers. Amongst the rest, he declared that *the assertions of Luther were justly condemned, and that Luther and his adherents were wicked and detestable heretics.* The errors which he actually held, he publicly recanted; but relapsing into them, and offering again to retract them, as Sir Thomas More

\* Collier Ch. Hist; Wood Athen, Oxon; Parsons' Three Convers. Fox relates the execution of some persons who were alive and well when he wrote. Being detected and exposed respecting one of these, Marbick, he in a later edition of his book, calls those who detected him, “carpers, wranglers, exclaimers, depravers, whisperers, railers, quarrel-pickers, corner-creeper, fault-finders, spider-catchers, &c.” Among other revolting lies, he tells of the death of one Grimshaw, by his bowels falling out of his body; which pretended judgment of God, Grimshaw hearing read out of Fox's book from the pulpit, he brought an action against the parson.—Wood's Athen.

† Speaking of the horrible murder of Archbishop Beaton, he writes: “He was slain in his own castle of St. Andrews, *by the just revenge of God's mighty judgment*, by the hands of Lech and other gentlemen, who, *by the Lord stirred up*, brake in suddenly into his castle upon him, and in his bed murdered him, crying out: ‘Alas! slay me not; I am a priest.’”—Acts and Monum., p. 1272.

testifies, his offer could not be accepted. The Poet's second martyr, at this period, is James Baynam, who, though he professed Catholic doctrine on the trying question of the Sacrament, declaring that *in it there is the very God and Man in the form of bread*, yet being found heterodox on other points, and teaching, in particular, the heresy of Sabellius, namely, that *Christ is all the three Divine persons in one*, he was adjudged to the stake. He was evidently no Protestant martyr, for if Cranmer had examined him instead of Stokesley, his sentence would infallibly have been the same that it was.

Baynam recanted, as the former had done, but relapsing and being committed to the flames, a miracle, exceeding that of the three children in the Babylonian furnace, was wrought upon him, according to Fox, whom Southey follows : *when his arms and legs were half consumed*, they tell us, he cried out from the midst of the flames : “ Ye Papists, see a miracle : I feel no more pain than if I were in “ a bed of down ! ”—William Tyndal, who stands next in the Poet's martyrology, was a dissolute vagrant Priest, who lived in the open violation of his vow of celibacy, as well as of his other obligations. Undertaking to translate the Holy Scriptures into English, he

notoriously corrupted them in numberless passages, as Sir Thomas More has demonstrated.\* In conclusion, he was apprehended and executed by the Imperial Government of the Low Countries, in which Tyndal had fixed his residence, not for his English translation, nor for any offence against the English Government, with which the Emperor was then at variance, but for offences against his adopted country.

It is matter of surprise that, in the choice which our Poet makes among Fox's pretended martyrs, to be celebrated in his book, he should pitch upon Frith, Lambert, and the woman Askew; since it is notorious that his prime martyr, Craumer, was principally concerned in bringing these, among other Protestants, to the fiery stake. Fox unwillingly admits the fact where, speaking of this unhappy man's subsequent death by the flames, he says: “He  
“purged away by it his offence in standing  
“against Lambert and Allen, or if there were  
“others, with whose burning and blood his  
“hands were polluted.”† Mr. Southey's fa-

\* See Sir Thomas More's *Confutation of Tyndal*, or the citations from it in the *Vindication of the End of Controversy*, p. 97, &c. In the statute of the 34th and 35th of Henry VIII., the version in question is termed: “The crafty, false, and untrue translation of the Old and New Testament of Tyndal.”

† Fox, Acts and Monum.

vourite historian, Fuller, says, still more expressly : “ It cannot be denied that he had a  
 “ hand in the execution of Frith and other  
 “ godly martyrs ”—adding “ I will leave him  
 “ to sink or swim by himself where he is  
 “ guilty.”\* With respect to Askew, Cranmer  
 was publicly reproached with causing her death,  
 by her companion and friend, Joan Knell,  
 when, subsequently, he was on the point of  
 pronouncing the same sentence on the latter  
 woman. “ It is not long ago,” she said, “ since  
 “ you condemned Ann Askew for a piece of  
 “ bread; and now you are ready to con-  
 “ demn me for a piece of flesh.”† The Poet  
 devises a lame excuse for Cranmer, by pre-  
 tending that he had not made up his mind  
 against the Catholic Doctrine, when he per-  
 secuted the Protestants to death for opposing  
 it; but his author, Fuller, expressly says that  
 he “ argued against Lambert, *contrary to his*  
 “ *own private judgment.*” Indeed it is univer-  
 sally acknowledged, that he was a thorough-  
 paced Lutheran, or Zuinglian, when he tra-  
 velled through Germany, and married Osian-  
 der’s sister for his second wife, in 1529.—It  
 must be admitted, however, that Mr. Southey  
 has shewn prudence in leaving out of his Mar-

\* Eccl. Hist.

† Dr. Heylin’s Hist. of Reform.



tyrology some of Fox's choice martyrs. Among these are Robert King, Robert Debnam, and Nicholas Marsh, “ hanged,” says Fox, “ for *taking down the Rood* at Dovercourt—“ being moved thereto,” he adds, “ by the “ spirit of God.” He accordingly honours them with a large wood-plate, that represents them hanging on three gibbets.\* The fact is, they were dissolute fellows, who, with a fourth associate, robbed a church by night in Kent, taking from it, as Fox acknowledges, a crucifix, a coat, some shoes, and some wax candles. Other writers say they stole offerings of great value. Being detected, they were tried and executed for felony, and their bodies hung in chains.

The Poet takes care, however, to relieve his tragical composition with episodes of a less melancholy nature. He tells us of a fanatical nun in Kent, who pretended to foretell King Henry's death, as likewise that Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More gave credit to the prediction : to which story he is sensible that of Elizabeth Croft, who uttered protestant prophecies and threats from the interior of a wall at Aldgate, and the conventicle prayer for Queen Mary's death,† may be successfully

\* Acts and Mon., p. 1081. † Stow's Chron. Dr. Heylin's Hist.

opposed. He next declaims against the nurseries of our literature and morality, the monasteries, with all the virulence and effrontery of a field-preacher; charging their inhabitants with the corruptions of Manichean errors and practices, that is, with unnatural crimes. Other Protestant writers, however, of a different character from Fox and Southey, have vindicated the religious from the villainous calumnies of their interested enemies,\* who made fortunes for themselves, as well as for their rapacious master and his courtiers, out of the spoils of the monasteries. The perfidy, and indeed the perjury of one of these inquisitors, Dr. John London, was so flagrant that it could not be screened by his employer, the unprincipled Cromwell. Accordingly he was left to the course of the law, and confined for life, after a disgraceful exhibition of his person on a horse with his face to its tail, and with papers declaring his guilt, tied about his head.

That there were popular superstitions in the reign of the last Henry, as there are also in the reign of King George IV. (if any one will take the pains to collect them from vergers, and clerks of cathedrals and other churches, and

\* Dugdale, Warwickshire, Monasticon. Spelman, Collier, Heylin, Fuller, &c.

such like ignorant people) may be easily believed, but that the Prelates of the Church or the Superiors of our schools of literature, as the Monasteries then certainly were, propagated them, is a foul calumny, unsupported by any plausible argument. It is a still fouler calumny to charge them with practising and promoting religious imposture of any kind ; but, as this calumny suits Mr. Southey's purpose of inflaming ignorant readers against the Catholics, he scruples not to publish it. Having gratified his prejudices on these subjects, he returns to that which, on the same account, is his favourite one, the execution of Protestants : unluckily, however, for him, the sufferers whom he here treats of, are those whom his great saint, Cranmer, was principally concerned in burning. The latter's conduct, in these tragical scenes, as well as in all the rest of his public transactions, was directed by the will of his unrelenting master, Henry VIII., a tyrant who, as his contemporaries used to say of him, “ never spared woman in his lust, nor man in his wrath ; so that, if all the patterns of a merciless prince had been lost in the world, they might have been found in him alone.”\* Yet even

\* Dr. Heylin, in his History, p. 15, quoting Sir Walter Raleigh.

Henry VIII. has found an apologist and partially a panegyrist in our present Poet-Laureat!\*

The Poet begins his account of the child Edward's reign with that of the Reformation, so called : but both accounts, and especially the latter, is notoriously defective and false. In justice to his readers he should have informed them that the religious changes in question did not originate in England, but were imported from Germany, where a turbulent Friar, by name Luther, having quarrelled with the Pope on the subject of Indulgencies, studied how he could most annoy him by contradicting the Catholic doctrine, in every particular ;† that he professed to have learnt his first and most important change from *the father of lies*,‡ Satan, and that his, Luther's followers, in adopting his pretended Reformation, became, by his own confession, worse, instead of better Christians ; § finally, that

\* Vol. ii. p. 104.

† Writing in defence of the real corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament, Luther says, that he had taken great pains to explain away those texts of Scripture which prove this doctrine, because, he says, “ *I saw how much I should thereby have incommoded Popery ;* but,” he adds, “ there was no way of escaping ; the text of the Gospel was too strong against me.”—Epist. ad Argentin. Opera Luth. tom. vii. fol. 502.

‡ “ I happened to wake before midnight, when Satan argued with me as follows, &c.”—On Private Mass, vol. vii. fol. 228.—See the substance of the conference in *Letters to a Prebendary, Letter V.*

§ “ Men are more revengeful, avaricious, and much worse than

professing, as the Protestants did, and as they still do, to be guided by the word of God, contained in the Holy Scriptures, which word they also maintain to be as clear as it is unerring, they quickly split into hundreds of different sects, that condemned and persecuted each other, no less than the Catholics.\* If the real truth is to be told, the same account of the rise and progress of Protestantism in this island is to be given, as of the same events on the continent. The important change was devised and carried on by wicked men for the gratification of their passions, not from any motive of religion or reference to revealed truths; but having been

“ they were under Popery.”—Luth. in Postil. Evang. 1. Advent. Bucer, Calvin, Erasmus, &c. testify to the same effect.

\* See Bossuet’s celebrated work on the *Variations of the Protestants*. Calvin wrote thus to Melancthon, Luther’s head disciple :

“ It is of the greatest importance that no account of the divisions that are amongst us (Protestants) should go down to future ages : for it is worse than ridiculous that, after breaking off from all the world, we should have agreed so little among ourselves, ever since the beginning of the Reformation.”—Calvin Epist. Another leading Protestant writes : “ Our people are carried away by every wind of doctrine. If you know what their belief is to-day, you cannot tell what it will be to-morrow. Is there one article of religion, in which the churches that are at war with the Pope, agree together? If you run over all the articles, from the first to the last, you will not find one which is not held by some of them as an article of faith, and rejected by others as an impiety.”—Dudith inter Epist. Bega.

once established, and other persons of better principles being engaged to support it, they naturally turned over the inspired pages to draw from them some plausible arguments in favour of their respective systems. It may well be supposed that King Henry's courtiers, who had participated in all his crimes, were not more virtuous or religious than he himself was. This king therefore being dead and his son and successor being only nine years old, the chief of the courtiers, being sixteen in number, and Lords of the Council, assembled to raise themselves to higher honours than they had hitherto possessed, and to property adequate to such new dignities. The first point was soon settled, each one choosing, for the most part, such titles and offices as were most gratifying to his ambition, and the young King's uncle, in particular, Sir Edward Seymour, contriving to be named Duke of Somerset and Lord Protector: but as to encreasing the fortune of these hungry courtiers, in a degree equal to their common avarice, there was an almost insuperable difficulty. In the end, no resource was found but in the remaining spoils of the ancient religion, which they accordingly proceeded to alter, in conformity with this interested purpose. The monasteries had been

universally destroyed and their property swallowed up; but there remained between two and three thousand chantries, in which prayers were daily offered up for their deceased founders; the endowments of these, it was plain, might contribute largely to the above-mentioned project; and though Henry had, by his last will, founded a chantry for himself at Windsor, and though Cranmer, with eight other bishops, had just before performed a public Mass for the deceased King of France, yet the council resolved and caused the people to be taught that prayers for the dead are vain and superstitious. Conformably with this resolution the chantries, together with the colleges, to the number of ninety, and a still greater number of hospitals, were disposed of for the benefit of Somerset and his rapacious associates. Not content with the largest share of this booty, nor with the numerous ecclesiastical livings which the Poet himself reproaches the Protector with having usurped, he fleeced most of the bishoprics of their best manors, in doing which he found no prelates more subservient to his sacrileges than Ridley and Cranmer.\* He had suppressed the rich bishopric

\* Ridley surrendered four of the best manors of the see of London in one day; Cranmer parted with more than half of the possessions

of Durham, and he would shortly have suppressed the rest of them, in conformity with the system of his confidential adviser, Calvin, had not his career, together with his life, been cut short by his fellow-counsellor, Dudley, Earl of Warwick. Another resource of these interested reformers were the shrines, rich with jewels and the precious metals, of the martyrs and other saints, together with their images, and the ordinary one of Christ on the cross, consisting often of silver or gold, or at least ornamented with those metals. To furnish a pretext for seizing and melting them down, the Council pretended in their proclamations, that every degree of respect for relics and other memorials of departed saints, and every prayer invoking their prayers, is idolatry. In support of this, the English Bibles were corrupted, by substituting the word *idol* for *image*, wherever it occurs in the sacred text. We have in Burnet part of one of the royal infant's scholastic exercises, addressed to his uncle, Somerset, and prefacing

of that of Canterbury.—Collier's Records, 67. Somerset aimed at getting Lambeth Palace and Westminster Abbey into his possession, and actually set his men to pull down St. Margaret's beautiful church, when they were driven away by the parishioners. He afterwards demolished several churches and ecclesiastical buildings in the Strand, to make room and furnish materials for his palace of Somerset House.



a collection of such corruptions and misapplications of the Old Testament.\* A third fund of spoils were the decorations of altars, and other furniture of the ancient church service, consisting of gold and silver chalices, ciboriums, altars, tabernacles candlesticks, censors and other articles, too numerous to be enumerated, with which every church and chapel throughout the kingdom was furnished. The use and magnificence of these were connected with the doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament, and of the sacrifice of the mass. Somerset therefore, with his fellow-counsellors, of course, rejected this doctrine, and sent agents throughout the kingdom to seize upon all church plate, leaving a single chalice and a plain wooden table instead of an altar for each church. Together with the plate the priestly vestments of gold tissue were carried off: these were either burnt to extract the metal, or were seen as domestic furniture in the houses of the plunderers. In the mean time, the most efficacious means were taken for repressing the ancient doctrine respecting the sacrament, and instilling contrary tenets into the minds of the people.

Mr. Southey, with other Protestant writers,

\* Records, p. ii, n. 2.

seems to agree in the justice of the above description, as far as relates to the ambition, avarice, and irreligion of Protector Somerset and the council in general; but, he speaks in high terms of the religious views and conduct of Archbishop Cranmer and his clerical associates. But, alas! Cranmer has left upon record his solemn decision, that bishops are nothing more than the king's officers for executing his ecclesiastical business, as magistrates are for executing his temporal concerns.\* Accordingly, he set an example at the beginning of this infant's reign, of taking out a new episcopal commission from Edward to govern his diocese, *during his good pleasure*, that is to say, during the good pleasure of Somerset;† and he issued his pastoral mandates in the affairs of religion, not by his own authority, or that of scripture, but by *the resolution of the Lord Protector and the privy council*.‡ That the clergy, from the

\* Burn's Rec., b. iii. n. 21. Collier's Rec., n. 49.

† Burn, p. ii. p. 6. Collier.

‡ "This is to advertise your Lordship, that my Lord Protector, with advice of other of the king's council, hath fully resolved that no candles be borne on Candlemas Day, nor ashes or palms used any longer: wherefore I beseech you to cause admonition thereof to be given in all parish churches throughout your diocese."—Archbishop Cranmer's Letter to the Bishop of London. Collier, p. ii. p. 241.

highest to the lowest, had no power or judgment in the religious changes of Edward's reign, is manifest from the prohibition of preaching, while the royal commissioners, almost all of them laymen, made their spiritual visitation for judging of all doctrines and religious practices throughout the kingdom then issued ; and from the arbitrary punishment of those bishops, such as Heath of Worcester, Day of Chichester, and Gardiner of Winchester, who ventured to oppose these decisions of the council.\* Somerset carried this so far as to send his secretary, Cecil, to the last named Bishop, requiring him to send him the notes of a sermon which he was to preach at court, for his the Protector's examination, and sentenced him to prison for uttering tenets when he preached it, which he, Somerset, disapproved of.† No doubt the Duke acted in the name of his royal nephew ; and accordingly, in the proclamation respecting certain changes in the liturgy, he introduced the child, then barely ten years of age, declaring thus : “ We would not have our subjects so much mistake our judgment, or so

\* The Bishops of Winchester, Worcester, and Chichester were imprisoned, and the Bishop of Durham turned out of the Council for objecting to the proposed changes.

† Collier, p. 249, &c. Dodd.

much mistrust our zeal, as though we could not discern what ought to be done. God be praised, *we know what, by his word, is meet to be redressed*, and have an earnest mind, with all convenient speed, to set forth the same.”\*

Such were the causes, and such was the commencement of those changes which took place about the middle of the sixteenth century, in the original Christianity of this country! The effects of them on the morals of the inhabitants soon became manifest. To begin with the head Reformers, those in the Privy Council: their intrigues and contests with each other are recorded in characters of blood. The Lord Protector Somerset got his brother, Thomas Seymour, Lord High Admiral, condemned and beheaded on frivolous charges, but in reality to gratify his Duchess, who was jealous of the Queen Dowager, now married to Lord Thomas. In return, Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and afterwards Duke of Northumberland, uniting most of the other counsellors against Somerset, caused him to be arraigned and publicly executed with another of their colleagues, Sir Henry Arundel. Proceeding in his towering ambition, he got the royal lady, Jane Grey, to marry one of his sons, with a view to their succeeding to the throne, in place

\* Collier, p. 246.

of King Henry's daughters, and then, as was generally believed, took off young Edward by poison; in all these scenes of iniquity and bloodshed, Archbishop Cranmer, siding as usual with the stronger party, took his full share of guilt. With respect to the morals of the people at large; the very advocates of Protestantism draw the most frightful picture of them, when this began to produce its effect upon them. Even Burnet says that “The sins of England did, at that time, call down from heaven heavy curses on the land.”\* The ecclesiastical collector, Strype, speaking of that period, bewails “The covetousness of the nobility and gentry, the oppression of the poor, the want of redress at law, the venality of the judges, the impunity for murder, increase of adultery and whoredom, and the depravity of the clergy, from the bishops down to the curates.”† Camden adds: “The sacrilegious avarice of the times seized upon colleges, chantries, and hospitals, under pretence of superstition: whilst ambition and jealousy among the great, and insolence and sedition among the people swelled to such a pitch that England seemed to be raving mad.”‡

The young King Edward being no more, our

\* Hist. Ref., p. ii. p. 226. † Memor. Eccles., b. ii. c. 23.

‡ Camden. Apparat. ad Annal. Eliz.

Poet says nothing of the nine days' wonder, as it was called, of Lady Jane Grey's reign, except to extenuate the treason of Cranmer, who was deeply involved in that usurpation. He alleges that, "believing, like the late young King, that "it was *necessary for the preservation of the* " *Protestant faith*, he still opposed the measure, "but yielded when the dying Edward told him "he hoped he alone would not stand out and "be more repugnant to his will than all the "rest of his Council was."\* What an excuse is this alleged request of a child for the treason and perjury of his aged Guardian and Archbishop! Was the latter ignorant of the rightful order of succession? Was he forgetful of his obligations to Henry and to the mother of Elizabeth? Or was he indifferent to the sacred duty of the Oath which he had taken as executor of Henry's will, to observe the injunctions of it? The fact, however, is, that every other Protestant of distinction, no less than Cranmer, and the Prelates Ridley, Latimer, Jewel, Sandys, Poynt, Goodrich, Coverdale, &c. took part† with

\* Vol. ii. p. 141.

† Stow says, "Ridley vehemently persuaded the people in the title of the Lady Jane, and inveighed earnestly against the title of the Lady Mary. Poynt, Bishop of Winchester, appeared in arms against the latter. Goodrich, Bishop of Ely, Sandys, Archbishop of York, &c., were deeply embarked in the same cause."

Jane against Mary and Elizabeth, at the critical moment in question, because Jane was an avowed Protestant. Hence, if Elizabeth had succeeded to the crown in the first instance, instead of Mary, Cranmer would, in all probability, have suffered death, even more speedily than he actually did, from the former's resentment. The difference would have been that he would have suffered the penalties of high-treason instead of petty treason. Mary is, however, at length, seated on her rightful throne; and now our Poet has another opportunity of indulging his taste and exercising his fancy in describing the sufferings of Fox's martyrs. But, though he is diffusive and eloquent on this melancholy subject, he overlooks the important observation which Catholic writers have suggested to him; namely, that, notwithstanding the sufferers were persecuted for their Religion, it was not precisely on this account, but from a persuasion, whether well or ill founded, of the Queen's Council, that the peace of the country never could be restored, while the then still encreasing sects of Protestants had a holding in it. In proof of this, it has been observed, that no Protestants were molested during almost the two first years of Mary's reign, nor till the second Pro-

testant rebellion, that of Sir Thomas Wyat,\* broke out, which latter threatened her life, and nearly overturned her Government; that neither the Pope, in his instructions to the Queen, nor his Legate, Cardinal Pole, in the Episcopal Synod which he held, inculcated a word in favour of persecution;† and that in the Royal Council, in which this measure was unhappily resolved upon, the arguments of its chief advocate, Gardiner, were of a political, not a religious cast. ‡

The Poet's selections from the ponderous volumes of the lying Fox,§ are, of course, those

\* The pretext for this rebellion was the match with Philip; but Dr. Heylin owns, that the restoration of Protestancy was *the principal matter aimed at*. Fox owns that Wyat's party "conspired for religion."

† See the Pope's Instructions in Dodd's Church History, vol. i. and an account of Cardinal Pope's Synod in Burnet's History.

‡ Burnet, p. xi. p. 299.

§ The following specimen of Fox's falsehood is exhibited by the Church Historian, Collier. Fox relates that the old Duke of Norfolk being to dine with the Chancellor, Gardiner, on the day of Latimer and Ridley's execution, he would not sit down to table till he learnt by express that the tragedy had been performed; that, being struck with a mortal disease of a suppression of urine, he was carried to bed, and died within a fortnight. To refute this fabrication, Collier, who was a high-church Protestant, shews, that the Chancellor took his seat in the House of Lords twice after this pretended mortal disease, and died at last, not of that disease,



which, with the help of his own embellishments, are the best calculated to inflame the public mind against his Catholic countrymen. It may well be supposed that he says nothing of many of Fox's favourite martyrs, such as William Flower, who stabbed a priest at the altar of St. Margaret's Church, William Gardiner, who attacked Cardinal Henry, King of Portugal, as he was saying Mass in the Cathedral of Lisbon, and seized upon the host and the chalice; George Eccles, alias Trudge-over-the-world, and the other Preacher, Rose, who publicly prayed for the Queen's death; the three Guernsey women, who are proved to have been thieves, and many others who were amenable to the laws for their actions and doctrines, independently of those connected with the new religion. Neither does the writer set forth the divisions in point of doctrine which existed among the sufferers, and which were carried to such a length, that one of his favourite martyrs, Philpot, spit in the face of another associate, calling him and those of his opinion, “ flaming fyerbronnnes of Hell, membres of the Divell,

disease, but of the gout. Finally, that the Duke of Norfolk had been dead above a year before this dinner-party could have taken place. Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, folio, vol. ii. p. 386. Notwithstanding the disproof of this falsehood, Mr. Southey relates it in detail, set off with his own poetical inventions, vol. ii. p. 209.

“ &c.”\* Those unfortunate men, whom he picks out of the Protestant martyrology for the imitation of other Christians, Rogers, Saunders, Taylor, &c., were apostate Catholic Priests, who, wanting grace and self-denial to keep their vows of continence, exchanged their own Religion for another, which allowed them to take wives, and which gave them Church-livings into the bargain. The Poet has displayed their attachment to the married state, and the advantage, according to his notion, of missionary clergymen, in particular, having wives to accompany them;† but he has not attempted to disprove the obligation Christians are under of keeping their voluntary vows; nor has he ventured to explain away the emphatical declaration of the Apostle, which purports, that they who violate this obligation, render themselves liable to eternal reprobation ‡.

\* Strype's Mem. Eccl. vol. ii. rec. 48.

† “ In our days, when Protestant Missions have been undertaken upon a great scale, it has been found that the wives of the Missionaries have contributed their full share to the success which has been obtained”—Vol. ii. p. 214.—On the other hand, it appears that the Preachers who went out in the ship *Duff*, to the South Sea Islands, found themselves obliged to take muskets on shore with them, to protect their wives from the brutality of the savages.

‡ *The younger widows refuse; for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry; having damnation, because then they have cast off their first faith.*—Tim. v. 11—12.

It may be worth while here to exhibit the real portraits of John Fox's head-martyrs, meaning those of the Prelatic order, which, though less pleasing than his pictures of them, especially after they have been retouched and varnished by the Laureate's pencil, are far more like the sketches which have been left us by the ancient masters. To begin, then, with John Hooper: he was an apostate Cistercian Monk, who, having married a Dutch woman, lived in the open breach of his other religious vows, no less than that of chastity. He appears to have been first a Lutheran; but, flying abroad, to escape the persecution of Henry's Six Articles, he became intimate with Bullinger, the head disciple of Zuinglius, whose Ultra-Calvinisin he brought with him into this country and established here,\* for its confusion and misery, during the two ensuing centuries. Being a vehement advocate for that sacrilege and rapine in which the late King's Council, as has been described, was so deeply involved, he became a prime favourite, first, with the sacrilegious So-

\* “ A controversy, unhappily, moved by *Bishop Hooper*, was “ presently propagated among the rest of the clergy, touching caps “ and surplices.”—Dr. Heylin, *Hist.* p. 92. The latter was the chaplain and biographer of Archbishop Laud. Cranmer maligned him for worse than “ Calvinistical principles.”—Wood's *Athen.* Oxon.

merset, and then with his successor and destroyer, Northumberland. The latter promoted him first to the See of Gloucester, and next to that of Worcester; and, though he filled all England with his invectives against the alleged Popery and anti-christianism of surplices and square college-caps,\* yet, when he found that he could not get ordained without wearing them, he dispensed with himself, on the occasion, yet, without abandoning his system concerning them. In like manner, though he had been a violent declaimer against clerical pluralities, he could reconcile it to his conscience, for the sake of his family, to hold at the same time, both the above-mentioned Bishoprics. Among his Puritan disciples were several of Fox's martyrs, who himself was a Puritan, and never would subscribe the Articles. Mr. Southey's "protomartyr," Rogers, and his "leader of noble martyrs," Philpot, were among these. Fox relates, that the former of these, when in prison, foretold to the printer of his Acts and Monuments, that he would live to see the Gospel restored, at which time he was directed to enjoin the ministers to observe a certain Puritanical form of Church-government, which, he said, had been concerted between

\* Heylin, &c.

him and Master Hooper: adding, that “if they  
 “ will not do so, their end will be worse than  
 “ ours.” He proceeds to the dispute about  
 Priests’ caps and other attire, adding, that he,  
 Rogers, wore a round cap, “and never would  
 and never did wear the (square) cap.”\*  
 Hooper was charged, not only with heresy, but  
 also with encouraging those who prayed for the  
 Queen’s death.† Latimer was named to the  
 Bishopric of Worcester by Henry VIII.; but,  
 being a Lutheran in principle, he was four dif-  
 ferent times summoned to give an account of  
 his faith, by Wolsey, Wareham, or the King  
 himself, on all which occasions he dissembled  
 and “subscribed such articles as they pro-  
 “pounded to him.” This is said by Fox, who  
 also publishes extracts from his sermons at Cam-  
 bridge and at Court, fitter for the mouth of a  
 buffoon than a Bishop. He chimed in, in all the  
 changes of Edward’s reign; and, as he had  
 acted a part in the tragedy of Lambert’s  
 burning,‡ for holding the self-same doctrine,  
 concerning the Sacrament, which he himself  
 held, so he now joined with Cranmer and  
 Ridley in signing the condemnation of Joan  
 Butcher,§ who was burnt for maintaining the  
 singular opinion of Valentinian concerning the

\* Act. and Mon. p. 1492.

† Dodd’s Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 377.

‡ Collier, Fox, &c.

§ Burnet’s Records.

formation of Christ's body. He had before all this prostituted his preaching in seconding the Protector's unnatural and groundless jealousy of his brother, the Lord Admiral,\* whom he brought to the block, without allowing him to make his defence.

As if conscious that he had concealed the defects and crimes of his other pseudo-martyrs, while he paints in glowing colours their sufferings, in order to engage the feelings of his readers, our Poet, when he comes to exhibit the portrait of the first Protestant Bishop of London, says of him: "the excellent Prelate, " Nicholas Ridley's memory is without spot or " stain;" and yet, in the very next paragraph to that in which he asserts this, he says: "Rid- " ley might have been proceeded against for " *treason*; for he had, by order of the Council, " preached in favour of the Lady Jane." The fact is, he had exerted himself in the most violent manner, to get the usurper, Dudley's step-daughter, placed on the throne,† because she was a Protestant, as appears by the arguments

\* Heylin and Stow, A. D. 1553, speak of Latimer's invective against the sufferer a few days after his execution; but Saunders, who was present on the occasion, says that he paved the way for it by a previous sermon, charging the Admiral with treason.

† Stow writes: "Dr. Ridley vehemently persuaded the people in the title of the Lady Jane, and inveighed earnestly against the title of the Lady Mary."

he made use of on the occasion.\* Hence we are left to conclude, that *treason* itself, according to Mr. Southey's creed, is *no spot or stain* in the character of a Protestant martyr, provided it be committed *against a Catholic Sovereign!* We know, with equal certainty, that, within nine days after his promotion to the See of London, he alienated four of its best manors to the King, and among others, Stepney and Hackney, “in order to gratify some of the courtiers.” † Was this flagrant simony in selling the best property of his Bishoprick, for the gratification of avaricious courtiers, however, it was sanctioned by the practice of the other Protestant Bishops, at the beginning of the Reformation, so called, no spot or stain on the memory of a Protestant martyr? ‡ Finally, is there no guilt or disgrace in one Protestant martyr taking part in burning at the stake other Protestant martyrs, as Bishop Ridley, no less than his brethren, Cranmer, Latimer, and Coverdale did, in the cases of the over-righteous Van Parre and the ready-spoken Mrs. Botcher? What brilliant and moving stories of this man and this woman's barbarous martyr-

\* See these arguments in Collier's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 343.

† Strype's Mem. Eccl. vol. iii. p. 234.

‡ Burnet's Ref. part ii. rec. 35, &c.

doms would not Mr. Southey have worked up, had it suited his purpose, to display the persecutions exercised by the Church of England!

But Fox's and the Poet's martyr by excellence, is the celebrated Cranmer; accordingly, they bestow much more pains in setting off his character, as a model of Christian virtue, than upon any others whom they mention. Let a few undenied, well-known, and incontrovertible facts, speak to the merits of this boasted saint and martyr. He became first known by being expelled from his fellowship at Jesus College, Cambridge, for marrying, contrary to the college statutes and his own oath, though he concealed his wife as long as he could at an obscure inn. He became better known by suggesting the expedient which King Henry afterwards followed for getting rid of his lawful wife, and marrying her maid, Anne Boleyn. He, therefore, was employed to put it in execution, by procuring the judgments of foreign divines, as to the natural unlawfulness of marrying a brother's widow in any case whatever; and he was rewarded for his pains with the See of Canterbury. In Germany, he became a confirmed Lutheran, \* whatever his religion was before; as also a bigamist, by marrying Osiander's sister. Thus, again, he

\* Fox.



violated the Church-law and that of the country. So strict was the latter, under the jealous lecher, Henry, that Cranmer was reduced to smuggle his German wife on shore in a chest.\*

To obtain consecration, together with the privileges of his Metropolitan See, as Legate and Penitentiary of the Pope, it was necessary he should take an oath of fealty and obedience to him: he, accordingly, took the oath publicly, but, retiring apart, made a private protestation against it, thus recording his prevarication and perjury. Being seated in his chair of Primacy, he steadily went through all the scandalous work which his master's lawless passions imposed upon him. He began with an hypocritical and collusive letter to the King, dated March 11, 1533, representing to him the scandal taken at the undecided state of the divorce, and demanding of him, as Supreme Head of the Church, the necessary power to pronounce upon it.—Accordingly, on the 20th of the following May, he decided that Henry's marriage with Queen Catharine was invalid, and that therefore he was free to marry another woman; in the mean-

\* For the truth of this story, Parsons appealed to Cranmer's daughter-in-law, then living; and it is rendered probable by Henry's interrogating the Archbishop, whether his *chamber would stand the test of the six articles?* and by his answer, that he *had sent back his wife to her friends in Germany.*—Collier, vol. ii. p. 200.

time he himself had stood witness to the monarch's nuptials with Ann Boleyn six months previously, namely, on Nov. 14, 1532.\* In less than three years afterwards, the King becoming tired or jealous of Ann Boleyn, and enamoured of Lady Jane Seymour, Cranmer first gave sentence of invalidity against her marriage with Henry, on account of an alleged precontract with a different person, and then divorced her from him, on the charge of adultery!† Ann of Cleves was Henry's fourth wife, who, being reported to have been under a previous contract to the Duke of Lorrain's son, Cranmer took official cognizance of the case, and pronounced that no such contract existed. But the King becoming within a few months disgusted with his German bride, the ever-accommodating Primate took it upon his conscience to set his master once more at liberty from his nuptial bonds, by pronouncing that the above-mentioned pre-contract of his wife was in actual existence! Henry being dead, Cranmer proved just as obsequious to the Duke of Somerset as he had been to the former. He took out a fresh commission for holding his See during the good

\* Heylin's Hist.

† Burnet says, "The two sentences, one for adultery, the other of divorce, for a pre-contract, did so contradict one another, that one, if not both, must be false."

pleasure of the child, Edward, that is, of Somerset himself, and he surrendered to his use, or rather, to that of Somerset, the better half of the possessions of his See.\* He even gratified the Protector with signing the warrant for the execution of his brother, the Admiral, though the Prelate's character would have excused him from the deed of blood, had he been desirous of it.

When the Protector was supplanted by Dudley, he readily transferred his homage to the latter ; and, forgetful of his duty as executor of Henry's will, and of his personal obligations to him and to Ann Boleyn, he concurred in violating his trust and in altering the legal order of succession to the crown, by transferring the right of the Princesses, Mary and Elizabeth, to Dudley's step-daughter, Jane Grey ; for which act of high treason he was arraigned, and justly sentenced to death.

Mr. Southey admits that Cranmer condemned the heretical woman, Jane Bocher, and prevailed on the young King, then only fourteen years old, and who shed a flood of tears on the occasion, to sign the warrant for burning her ; adding, “ this is the only passage in Cranmer's “ life, for which no palliation can be offered ;” †

\* Henry Wharton apud Collier.

† Vol. ii p. 137.

but was he not equally active in bringing the poor Dutch heretic, Van Parr, to the stake? \* Did not he take part in burning John Lambert, Ann Askew, William Allen, John Frith, Tyndal's assistant in translating the Bible, and other Protestants, during Henry's reign, for denying the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament, to say nothing of a whole crowd of Anabaptists, condemned by him, in that and in Edward's reign? † The Poet excuses Cranmer for the former executions, by asserting, but without the least authority, that this Reformer then believed in the corporal presence; ‡ but his favourite author, Fuller, charges him, Cranmer, with arguing against Lambert, at his trial, "contrary to his own private judgment;" and adds, that, "as Lambert was burnt for denying the corporal presence, so Cranmer himself was afterwards condemned and died at Oxford for maintaining the same opinion." When it came to his own turn to suffer that cruel death, to which he had condemned so many others, and several of them on the same charge, he was very far from imitating their constancy. In a word, he signed six different retractations of Protestantism,

\* Burnet's Records, p. ii. n. 35.

† P. 80. Fox says he became a Protestant in 1529, before his promotion.

‡ Book v. sect. 6.

each one more express than that which preceded it, within the same number of weeks, and thus continued, till the very hour of his execution, either a sincere Catholic or an unprincipled hypocrite.\* Finding, however, that, in spite of these he must suffer, he in a fit of desperate fury retracted them all, and threatened that his hand, which had signed them, should be burnt before the rest of his body, which deed of desperation, in the spirit of Judas Iscariot, he is said to have effected! Is there in ecclesiastical history so unprincipled a Prelate as this boasted Apostle and Martyr of John Fox and Mr. Southey? After all, it is a circumstance to be for ever lamented, that Gardiner's opinion in the Queen's Council, as to the efficacy of persecution in producing uniformity of Religion, prevailed; and there is reason to believe, that those numerous bands (though far less numerous than Southey and Fox pretend) of tailors, weavers, labourers, and spinsters, who offered themselves to execution for their diversified opinions, would, for the most part, have acquiesced in the national faith, had they not been provoked to deny it by the flames that were lighted up for its preservation.

\* See Strype's Mem. Eccl. vol. iii. p. 234, from the Lambeth Records.

The four years of Mary's persecution of Protestants were succeeded by above two centuries of a Protestant persecution of Catholics, more than half of which is recorded in characters of blood; but this it suits Mr. Southey's purpose to suppress for the most part; and, when he does mention it, to misrepresent it in the grossest manner. Entering on his story of Elizabeth, he describes the Catholic Bishops as having been "gaping to see the day when they might wash their white rochets in her innocent blood;" and, yet, when the day did arrive, in which they might, at least, have hindered her from reigning, the people being Catholic, and every place in Church and State being filled with Catholics, not a finger, nor a tongue, nor a pen, did they move to exclude her from her inheritance. It had not been so, as has been said, at the accession of her Catholic sister; for then, not only Cranmer and Ridley, and Latimer, but all other Protestant clergymen and laymen of note broke into open rebellion against their Sovereign, merely because she was a Catholic. The writer extols the new Queen for her mildness and toleration towards the Catholics; and yet he confesses that she deprived all the Catholic Bishops of their Sees, except the despicable conformist, Kitchen of Landaff; but

he should have added, that she equally dispossessed the greater part of the other Church dignitaries, Heads of Colleges, and other respectable clergy, because they would not acknowledge, upon oath, her pretended spiritual supremacy. This sacrilegious claim, which could be supported on no principle but such as would have made Tiberius and Nero *Heads of the Christian Church*, in their respective reigns, equally scandalized thinking Protestants and sincere Catholics.\* Nor was it a mere title that Elizabeth affected; on the contrary, she asserted, both in her speeches from the throne†

\* The learned Protestant, Centuriator, Chemnitius, accused Elizabeth, as follows: “Fœmineo fastu, Papissam et Caput Ecclesiæ se fecit.”

† The following is an extract from the Queen’s speech in Parliament, March 29, 1586: “One matter toucheth me so near, as I may not overskip. The Church, whose overlooker God hath made me, whose negligence cannot be excused if any schisms or errors heretical were suffered. Some faults and negligences may grow and be, all which, if you, my Lords of the Clergy, do not amend, I mind to depose you. I am supposed to have many studies, but most philosophical; I must yield this to be true, that I suppose few that be not professors have read more; yet, among my many volumes, I hope God’s book hath not been my seldomest lectures. I see many over bold with God Almighty, making too many subtille scannings of his blessed will. The presumption is so great, as I may not suffer it, yet mind I not to animate Romanists nor tolerate newfangledness, and I mean to guide them both by God’s true rule, &c.”—Stow’s Annals.

and in her public acts, an unlimited right to pronounce in doctrinal matters, and to dictate in those of discipline, not only without the Bishops, but also in direct opposition to them. The reader may, indeed, smile at this vain female's claim to infallibility and unbounded spiritual power, if he be a Christian; but he must blush and feel indignant at the grovelling submission to it which those Prelates whom Mr. Southey so highly commends paid on every occasion.\*

In order to justify the bloody persecution which the remorseless Elizabeth and her unprincipled ministry commenced on the unoffending Catholics, our Poet descants on the persecutions, real or pretended, of different Catholic Princes abroad, and on the alledged plots of English Catholics at home. On both these subjects I wish the reader to consult the unanswerable **LETTERS TO A PREBENDARY**, and **THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY**, by Dr. Milner. This author proves, in his detailed account of different

\* See the style of Archbishop Parker's homage to Elizabeth, Collier's Rec. 21, and the submission of his successor, Grindal, with his brethren, to her, in the controversy concerning the exercise of *prophecy*, as it was called, which he and they had pronounced to be "set down in the Holy Scriptures," but which she condemned "as leading to schism."—Collier, p. ii. p. 596.



Kingdoms and States from France and Geneva to Scotland and Holland,\* that the professors of the ancient faith never practised such prompt and severe cruelty to preserve it,† as the new

\* Bayle and Rousseau, who were brought up Protestants, acknowledge that Protestantism was intolerant from its birth. Bergier defies its professors to name a province or town in which they did not exercise persecution during the sixteenth century, when they had the power to do so. De Hoof reproaches his countrymen thus: “*Crudelitatis odio in crudelitatem ruitis et antequam liberi estis dominari vultis.*”—Ger. de Brandt. Dr. Robertson expresses his abhorrence of the declaration of the Presbyterian Clergy to King James, namely, that it would be sinful in him to spare the lives of the Catholic Earls of Huntly, Errol, &c. Mr. Southey speaks with horror of the numerous executions of rebels by the Duke of Alva in the Low Countries, but the learned Feller maintains that the Prince of Orange’s Lieutenant Vandermerck killed more unoffending Catholics in those provinces during the year 1572 than Alva caused to be executed during the whole period of his government. This writer refers to judicial documents, still extant, shewing that the Protestants in North Holland exercised such horrible and refined cruelty on the Catholics in their power, as were never heard of before. They destroyed them by preventing them, with tortures, from ever sleeping; they fed them with salt herrings without allowing them a drop of water, till they died of thirst; they scorched them to death with the flames of spirituous liquors, in which their clothes had been steeped; they buried them alive in chests filled with rats.—Let. to Preb., chap. PERSECUTION.

† In disproof of Mr. Southey’s pretensions to mildness and toleration, in favour of Elizabeth and her government, it is sufficient to refer to their persecution of different Protestants for not agreeing with them in faith. In 1575 twenty-seven heretics were at one time, eleven at a second time, and five at a third, condemned for their errors by Sandys, then Bishop of London. Of these twenty were

religionists did to eradicate it, and to force their own opinions on the Christian world. In attempting this, as he shews, they filled every individual Kingdom, State, and City, in which they gained a footing, with tumults, rebellion, and bloody persecution. He also proves, that the several plots charged upon the English Catholics were either fabrications of their enemies, or conspiracies of those enemies against the Catholics, with the exception of Babington's attempt to free Mary of Scotland from her unjust confinement; an attempt, under all its circumstances, that was severely censured by the Catholics, and especially by their clergy both at home and in their seminaries abroad.\* The Poet descants repeatedly on the Bull of Excommunication published by the Pope, but never once notified to, much less

were whipped, others bore their faggots, and two, Peterson and Turwort, were burnt in Smithfield. In 1583 John Lewes, "for denying the Godhead of Christ," says Stow, was burnt at Norwich, where Francis Kett, M.A., suffered death for the same error six years later. In 1591 Hacket was hanged for heresy in Cheapside. The following Brownists or Independents suffered death in the same reign for their opinions, Thacker, Copping, Greenwood, Barrow, and Perry.—See Stow, Brant, Limborch, Neal, &c.

\* The seminary of Douay published a Letter to the Catholics of England on the occasion, strongly recommending to them submission and fidelity to Government. The same is the whole tenor of Cardinal Allen's answer to Cecil's *Execution of English Justice*.

accepted of by the English Catholics. It was worded in the usual style, to satisfy the Princes and States of Christendom, who were scandalized and alarmed at the conspiracies and rebellions which Elizabeth was continually exciting in their dominions, at the piracies she publicly exercised, and particularly at the Regicide she had, with equal perfidy and cruelty, committed on the Queen of Scots. Still they are pure calumnies of the Poet that the Catholic Martyrs who were slaughtered in Elizabeth's reign, were *Bull Papists*, as he terms them, and that they were so much as charged with having abetted the Bull. On the contrary, they continued to profess their fidelity to the Queen, at their death and under the gallows,\* as well as on their missions, and in their seminaries, and to perform every duty of allegiance to her, as was particularly and heroically demonstrated, when the Spanish Armada appeared off the coast.

But, though the Poet takes so much pains to vindicate this Protestant persecution, he never gives any information as to its nature or the number or quality of those who suffered in

\* The learned and pious F. Campion gave a signal proof of this in his dialogue with Lord C. Howard under the gallows. See Mem. of Miss. Priests, vol. i. p. 55.

it. It is sufficient, however, to open the Statute Book, in order to learn that the very first Act of Elizabeth's reign, (confirmed in c. 1. of her 5th,) the most severe punishment the law is acquainted with, that of hanging, cutting up and bowelling alive, was enacted against all those who should maintain the *spiritual* Supremacy of the Pope, or deny that of the Queen, which horrible sentence was inflicted on fifteen Catholics, *on that sole charge*, during the latter's reign. Indeed, all those Catholics who then suffered in consequence of the other persecuting statutes, might have redeemed their lives by taking the oath of Supremacy. To be brief: besides the above-mentioned sufferers, 126 Priests, several of whom had been graduates of Oxford, underwent the horrible butchery, merely for being Priests and exercising their spiritual functions,\* and about sixty other Catholics for being reconciled to the Catholic

\* Among these sufferers only eleven were so much as accused of any treason, and the falsehood of their pretended plot, that of Rheims, was so glaring that even Camden, one of Elizabeth's official writers, acknowledges them to have been political victims, sacrificed to appease the popular fury excited by the proposal of the Queen's marriage with the Duke of Anjou. He adds of the Queen: "Plerosque et his misellis sacerdotibus exitii in patriam conflagandi conscios fuisse non credidit."—*Annales Eliz.* A. D. 1582.

Religion, hearing Mass, or harbouring or aiding, &c. some or other of their clergymen. The names of several of the sufferers, together with their respective indictments, may be found in Stow's Annals, Wood's Athenæ, and other Protestant Works, no less than in Dodd's Church History and Dr. Challoner's accurate and edifying *History of Missionary Priests*. Besides these victims of public execution, all of whom acknowledged the Queen's temporal authority, we have the names of one hundred and five other priests, who were exiled from their homes and country, merely for being Priests, and of ninety other Catholic Priests or laymen, who perished in prison, during this persecuting reign. In the meantime the most horrible tortures were exercised on the Catholic prisoners, at the pleasure of Sir Owen Hopton, Lieutenant of the Tower, and other jailors,\* and the fine

\* Among these torments are reckoned by Rishton and Saunders, the *Dungeon*, resembling the prophet Jeremy's pit; the hole called *Little Ease*, so contrived that the prisoner could neither stand nor lie down in it; the *Scavenger's Daughter*, being an iron hoop, in which the prisoner's head and feet were made to meet the *iron manacles*, by which the prisoner was hung up in the air, for four, six, or eight hours at a time; the common *Stretching Rack*, by means of which the body was drawn out to the length of two feet beyond its natural size. To these must be added the torture of the needles, thrust under the finger nails, which several of them endured.

of twenty pounds each month for not attending the Protestant service, was rigorously exacted from those Catholics who were able to pay it. With what a collection of fiction and falsehood has not the Poet veiled the second, no less than the first formation of his Church!

Among those who were put to death at different times for aiding Priests, were three ladies, Margaret Middleton, by marriage Clithero, Ann Line, and Margaret Ward. The first mentioned of these was of an honourable family in Yorkshire, where her house was the general resort of the Priests in her neighbourhood. Being arraigned for this hospitality, and knowing that she could not answer the questions that would be put to her on her trial, without exposing the lives of those faithful Ministers, she persisted in standing dumb at the bar, in consequence of which she was condemned to be pressed to death. This sentence was carried into execution on York bridge, her hands and feet being fastened to four stakes, and a large board, loaded with heavy weights, being placed on her body, and left there till she expired. But neither the length of her torments nor the tears of her friends, husband and children could shake her resolution. What she said at the time was, " It is as well to go to Heaven this way

as any other." The most illustrious, however, of the female Catholic victims, undoubtedly, was the Queen of Scots. After being treacherously invited by Elizabeth into England, and perfidiously confined there during eighteen years, she was in a mock trial condemned, and then beheaded, for pretended crimes against Elizabeth, which were as much out of her power as they were remote from her disposition to commit. But the commissioners who superintended the bloody work, more than once, betrayed the real motive of it. "Your life," said the Earl of Kent to her, "would be death to our religion, and your death will be life to it!"\* Her earnest request to be allowed the consolations of her religion, was denied her at her death,† as these ever had been during her long imprisonment: so false are the assertions of the Poet concerning Elizabeth's toleration and regard for conscience! Speaking elsewhere of the rival Queens, he says of them: "They were both women of saintly piety!" That such is the character of Mary, but that the reverse is that of Elizabeth, the world is now satisfied, since Goodall, Stuart, and Whitaker, have exposed the forgeries of the Apostate Friar, Buchanan. The contrast between the

\* Camden Annal.

† Ibid.

rivals was particularly striking at their respective deaths. That of the former was truly worthy of a martyr—that of the latter characteristic of a reprobate.\*

No sooner had the church of England received a being from young Edward's uncle, the Protector Somerset, than she was found pregnant with an Esau and a Jacob, two hostile people who struggled together even in the womb. The one was bent on destroying every vestige of the ancient religion—the other aimed at retaining as much of this as suited its ideas and purposes. To the former belonged Rogers, Hooper, Coverdale, Knox, with all the Scotch Reformers, and Somerset himself. These were afterwards joined by Leicester, Cecil, Walsingham, John Fox, Cartwright, &c. The latter consisted of Cranmer, Ridley, with most of the Clergy, and Elizabeth herself. These were certainly more rational and moral—the others more ardent and consistent with their principles; for, whereas, both parties professed to be guided by Scripture alone, when the more moderate Protestants were called upon by their adversaries to produce chapter and verse for the use of surplices, tippetts, square caps, Deans and Chapters, the sign of the cross in baptism,

\* See the narrations of Collier, Camden, Whitaker, and Parsons, cited in *Letters to a Prebendary*, p. 246, sixth edition.



festival days, and a hundred other observances;\* they were unable to do so, and, therefore, were stigmatized as Papists by their adversaries; and separate conventicles were, of course, set up against them. The pretenders to *Pure Religion* were, indeed, kept down by the strong hand of Elizabeth; but, when James, who had been educated by their Scotch brethren, ascended the throne, they loudly called for the redress of the alledged superstitions and idolatry, in an address to him, signed by almost a thousand officiating Ministers of the establishment. Accordingly, he appointed a conference to be held between the parties at Lambeth, in which he put forth his newly acquired spiritual supremacy, in a much higher tone than it had ever been claimed by Innocent III. or any other Pope in or out of a Synod. He decided every point in debate, whether for or against the Puritans, by his own authority, threatening to “hurry out of the land” those who opposed it,† all which acts of unbounded Supremacy were lauded by the Bishops there present, who

\* The Presbyterian *Admonition to Parliament* declares that “The kingdom of Archbishops, Bishops, &c. cannot stand with Christ’s kingdom; and that the offices of Bishops, Deans, &c. are forbidden by the word of God.”—Madox. *Exam. of Neale’s Hist. of Puritans*, vol. i. p. 111.

† See Collier’s and Fuller’s relation of the Conference.

never delivered their opinions but upon their knees; while their Primate himself, Whitgift, pronounced that the King spoke by the special inspiration of God's spirit!

The contending parties were agreed upon the speculative points of Predestination and Reprobation,\* though the Poet insinuates the contrary; but, upon the abovementioned practical points of discipline they became more hostile to each other than ever; and it was easy to foresee that the party which maintained the fundamental principle of the Reformation, to whatever lengths and subdivisions these might conduct, would prevail. Accordingly, the Church of England, from the period in question, became formally divided into the *Church*, henceforward so called, and the *Puritans*, as they were denominated. It suits Mr. Southey's views to take part with the former; hence the remaining part of his book is more taken up with opposing the

\* That the Archbishop and Bishops were rigid Calvinists, there is infallible evidence, says Fuller, in the Lambeth Articles approved of by them. Barret, fellow of a college in Cambridge, having in a Sermon censured Calvin and his doctrine, was constrained to retract what he had advanced in the most explicit terms.—See Fuller's Hist. of Univ. of Camb. p. 150. See also the proposal of the Prelates to imprison for life, in solitary confinement, “all incorrigible FREE-WILL men.”—Strype Annal of Ref. vol. i. p. 214. These *Free-will men*, Mr. Southey calls *Pelagians*, and thereby intimates that he himself does not admit of *Free-will*.

Puritans than calumniating the Catholics, which will shorten the task of the present writer. The Poet says little of the Powder-plot, conscious that it was a bungling imitation of the Protestant-plot, by which James's father, King Henry Darnley, a Catholic, with his family, had been blown up and killed at Kirk-a-field by the Protestants. He also knew, that all the measures of the few desperate wretches concerned in it, were, in fact, under the direction of Cecil, Lord Salisbury, a man practised in the invention of plots, and in drawing those, whom he wished to destroy, into them.\* The little he does say on this subject, contains, however, two revolting falsehoods, namely, that the "scruples of the conspirators" were quieted by their confessor; whereas, it has been proved, that directly the contrary was the case, and that "Garnet received the honour of beatification from the Pope." To disprove this egregious falsehood, it is sufficient to inspect the catalogue of the deceased Catholics who have been so honoured. In like manner, all is false that the Poet writes concerning the moderation of James and his Church, and of his aversion to "making martyrs." So far from this being true, he is proved to have sacrificed a hecatomb of poor old women,

\* See this proved in *Letters to a Prebendary*, Letter VII.

under pretence of their being witches. In like manner, he sent his Bishops and Divines to the Calvinistic Synod of Dort, (saying it was his duty, as *Defender of the Faith*, to drive the Arminian doctrine to hell), where they concurred with the other Calvinist deputies in deciding that the grace of God in the Predestinate is not lost by the greatest crimes that man is capable of perpetrating. Again, he committed to the flames, not only Whitman and Legat, Protestant Arians, but he also sent to the butchery eighteen Catholic Priests and seven laymen\* merely on account of their religion. In several of these executions, the Bishops, particularly King, of London, and Neale, of Litchfield, were chiefly conspicuous. In the mean time the Primate, Abbott, wrote to James against tolerating what he called “the damnable heretical doctrine of the whore of Babylon, as hateful to God,” † &c.; while Archbishop Usher, with twelve other Irish Bishops, protested, from the Pulpit, against tolerating Catholics, ‡ and both Houses of Parliament addressed the King to execute the laws with increased severity against them, which work they added “would greatly advance the glory of Almighty God and your Majesty’s honour.” §

\* See their names and history.—Mem. Miss. Pr. and in Dodd.

† Rushworth’s Collect. vol. i. p. 4.

‡ Currie’s Hist. Review, vol. . . 109. § Rushworth, vol. i.

The schism which had divided the Church of England during the reign of James into two hostile parties, the Episcopalians and the Puritans, growing wider and wider, produced, under his son, Charles, its natural effect in a bloody and destructive civil war. The Poet of course sides with the party which, though vanquished at first, in the end proved victorious: and as the pretext for beginning it was the same which had produced insurrection and rebellion in every Christian country into which Protestantism had gained an entry, the alleged dread of unscriptural and superstitious Popery, it is natural for Catholics to take the same side, and to join with him in reprobating the folly, hypocrisy and multifarious wickedness of the Presbyterians, Independents, Erastians and other sectaries, comprehended under the general name of Puritans. Still it must be confessed, that they barely acted up to the grand principle of the Reformation; that is to say, as they could not find out in their Bible, surplices, tippets, square caps, deans, chapters, chancels, bowing to the sacred name, and to the communion table, with a thousand other practices and things which they objected to, they felt warranted in condemning them as unscriptural superstitions, and as sinful. On the other hand,

as they understood themselves to be called upon in the inspired text, *to bind their kings in chains, and their nobles in iron links*,\* so, upon the same principle, they conceived it to be their duty to lay hands upon Laud, and Strafford, and upon the King himself, for not a crime was then committed, as Clarendon remarks, without scripture, as explained by individuals, to justify it. With respect to the first of the above-mentioned victims, the Primate Laud, whose praises the Poet sings through the greater part of a hundred pages of his book, it is undeniable that he introduced many novelties into the establishment, which had till then passed for superstitious, such as auricular confession, assuming the title of *His Holiness*, and some that were considered as idolatrous, such as bowing to the communion table, surmounting it with a crucifix, &c. On the other hand, the Poet himself confesses that Laud maintained such slavish principles, respecting the despotic power of the Sovereign, that, if his enemies, Pym, Hampden, and Cromwell, had been suffered to transport themselves, as they wished to do, civil liberty would have been annihilated. The other “most illustrious martyr of the Church of England,” as Mr. Southey calls

\* Psalm cxlix.

him, King Charles I., was far from being so firm in its support as this title would imply. He certainly passed an Act to deprive the Bishops of their chief ornament and protection, their votes in Parliament ; and he offered, in the Treaty of the Isle of Wight, to pass another for substituting Presbyterianism to Episcopacy, during the ensuing three years. Nor is this surprising, when we find the most learned and able of his Bishops assuring him that Presbyters can, not only ordain Priests, but also consecrate Bishops.\* In fact, we know that Luther pretended to make Amsdorf Bishop of Naumburg, as the Poet's hero, John Wesley, did Dr. Coke, Bishop of North America. As to his loyal Catholics, who had exhausted their fortunes, and spilt their blood in his defence,† he consented, by the terms of that treaty, to give them up to the bigotry of his and their unrelenting enemies. The Poet says, “ that Charles

\* Usher. See Neal's History.

† When the war broke out, the Catholic Nobility and Gentry flew to arms universally, in defence of their Sovereign. Lord Castlemain has collected the names of two Noblemen, twelve Knights, fifteen Colonels, and one hundred and fifty-nine other Catholic Officers and Gentlemen, who lost their lives in the cause of loyalty. The same author gives an account of property sequestered by the rebels ; by which it appears that more than half of it belonged to Catholics.—See Cath. Apology, &c.

“ made known his resolution, that no Catholic, “ under his reign, should suffer death on the “ score of religion ;” and yet eleven Priests were hanged and bowelled\* in his reign, before his power was taken from him, as thirteen others were during the usurpation.† He asserts that “ the sanguinary laws had never been “ executed except in cases of treasonable practices ;” and yet it appears, that above two hundred Catholics had been put to death under Elizabeth and James I., unaccused of treason or any other offence, except the practice of their religion. He gives it as a proof of the intolerance of the Parliament, that “ the Catholics “ were, during its reign, compelled to perform “ their service at midnight, in fear and danger ;” whereas it is notorious that such had been their condition, in this respect, for near a century before, that is ever since the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign.

The greater part of the Poet’s book is made up of those fanciful and inconsistent theories

\* One of these, Lady Arundel’s chaplain, Hugh Green, condemned, barely for being a priest, was a full half hour under the executioner’s hands, who was raking in his bowels all the time to find his heart, while he himself was devoutly calling on Jesus.— See Miss. Pr., vol. ii. p. 215.

† See their names and history in Dodd, Miss. Pr., &c.



which characterize the Quarterly Review, and which therefore are undeserving of notice. What he says positively of the Catholics of this period, is, that, after the regicide, “they evinced a willingness to commence another such persecution “ (*as that under Queen Mary*), that they slighted “ the King in his exile, and treated with Crom- “ well for taking an oath of submission to his “ government, as the price of that indulgence, “ which he in his true spirit of toleration was “ willing to have granted.” The facts are, that the Catholics, broken and diminished as they were in number and in fortune by the former war, adhered to the son with the same disinterested loyalty as they had to the royal father; they fought for him while he had a regiment in his service, and they guarded him after his defeat at Worcester, with a fidelity not to be moved by the bribes or the threats held out by the enemy. The names of fifty-two Catholics, three of them priests, are upon record, who were acquainted with the important secret of Charles’s quality, while he was wandering about Boscobel, Moseley, and White Ladies; and the priest’s hiding holes are still shewn at the two first named places, where he was concealed, when he ventured down from the Royal Oak. As to “the true spirit of toleration” which

this Poet attributes to the Usurper, his continued robbery of the Catholic laity, and his butchery of the priests prove what this was in England, whilst the war of extermination, which he proclaimed and carried on in Ireland, still more forcibly demonstrates what it was there.\*

At the beginning of the second Charles's reign, the Puritans acquired the less offensive denomination of *Non-conformists*, and various plans were devised to re-unite them to the Established Church. These, however, were quashed by the Act of Uniformity, "some clauses of which," Mr. Southey writes, "the wisest statesmen and truest friends of the Church disapproved. One of these excluded all persons from the ministry, who had not received episcopal ordination. All, therefore, who had received Presbyterian orders, were to quit their benefices, or submit to be re-ordained."—Thus it is seen that this champion of the Church is a Presbyterian or Methodist at heart; or, at

\* He led his fanatic soldiers to believe that God required of them to extirpate the Irish population, in the same manner as the Israelites heretofore destroyed the tribes of Canaan. Accordingly, they murdered infants as well as men (sometimes even before they were born) exclaiming at the same time, "Nits will be lice." General Coote's cry of battle was, "Jesus, and no mercy."—See Dr. Curry's *Civil Wars of Ireland*.

least, that he makes Episcopacy, with its various ordinations and consecrations, consequent on priestly orders, a matter of indifference, contrary to the decision of the Bishops at the aforesaid period, and on a later occasion,\* and to the Church rubricks and uniform discipline. The writer, it seems, scouts the revolting calumny, that the Catholics burnt down London. What then must he think of the Protestants, who twice over recorded this infamous lie on their city monument, and who leave it standing there at the present day? In like manner he acquits them of the plot to murder the King, whose life they had saved in their priest's hiding holes, at the imminent danger of their own ! How dreadful then must have been Protestant bigotry at that period, which could, twice over, elicit resolutions in Parliament as to the reality of this trumped-up plot ! This, we know sent eighteen Catholics, one of them a peer, to the butchery, under pretence of its reality ! This excluded, and does still exclude all Catholic peers from

\* In 1662, the King having nominated four Presbyterian Ministers to Bishoprics in Scotland, the consecrating Prelates in England obliged them to renounce their former pretended orders, and to be ordained Deacons and Priests.—Collier, vol. ii. p. 887. Conformable to this was the doctrine even of Tillotson, Burnet, &c., on a later occasion.—See Birch's Life of Tillotson, p. 41, &c.

their hereditary seats in Parliament, on the same refuted and abandoned calumny!

The unbounded bigotry, which had brought the Royal Father to the block, drove his second son from the throne; the determining causes of which catastrophe were the toleration of the King, and the intolerance of his Bishops. They had sworn to his spiritual, as well as his temporal supremacy; they had recently abjured the position, that it is lawful to resist the King *on any pretext whatever*; but when he barely called upon them to join him in a general disavowal of all religious persecution whatsoever, whether of Dissenters, or of Quakers, or of Catholics, they called in the Prince of Orange to dethrone him, under a pretence, which first and last he solemnly disavowed, that he was bent on subverting the Protestant religion.\* How widely different was the conduct of the Catholic Bishops at Queen Elizabeth's accession to the throne!

Here the Poët drops his quill, and shuts up his phantasmagoria of a Church establishment;

\* The sincerity of James's Declaration for universal toleration is proved by the pains he took, in his brother's reign, to get the Act *De Hæretico Comburendo* repealed, and to protect and support the French Huguenots, driven from their own country by the repeal of the Edict of Nantz.

conducted, through the savage Britons, the barbarous Saxons, the Pope's Catholic missionaries, and the apostate monks and priests of Edward's and Elizabeth's reigns. He should have continued his narrative till the alteration of the established faith, in the important article of non-resistance, was practically denied by its former advocate, the Arian Primate, Tillotson ; till “ *the damnable heresy of Socinianism,*” as this Church had defined it,\* was publicly preached up by the famous Bishop Hoadley, and effectually protected by Government ;† till the same doctrine was taught in the Divinity lectures of the University ;‡ and till a learned Bishop and Professor had proclaimed, without contradiction, that the Protestant Religion consists in “ speaking what you think, and thinking what you please.”§—If the writer might advise the Poetical Historian, for the purpose of effectually vindicating and securing the Church he courts, it would be in these or in similar words :—In vain, Mr. Southey, do

\* In the canons of the Synod of 1640.

† The Convocation having threatened to censure Hoadley, it was dissolved by Government, in virtue of the Supremacy, and has never been allowed to assemble since.

‡ See the Divinity Lectures of Professor Hey, delivered at Cambridge.

§ Bishop Watson in his Apology, p. 3.

you rake together every kind of calumny and misrepresentation for aspersing the *One Holy Catholic Church*, which you profess to believe in when you repeat the creed. The charges confute themselves ! and, when exposed, fail not to draw over converts of the best description to her communion. It is equally vain in you to join with Primate Sancroft in dissuading dying Protestants from reconciling themselves to the Catholic Church, as Charles II; and innumerable other Protestants have done; in that trying situation : while not an instance can be produced of any Catholic who ever wished to die in any other communion than his own. The fact is, if a Christian has any conscience, it will speak out at that last extremity. Instead then, of such vain attempts, exert your best means to induce the majority of your Clergy to believe in, and openly to profess their own articles, and especially the great fundamental articles of the Unity and Trinity of the Godhead, and the Incarnation and Death of the Second Person of it. Without this, they are not Christians, and would have been burnt at the stake by Cranmer and Ridley, had they lived in their days. In the next place, Sir, I must observe to you, that it ill becomes a professing champion of the Established

Church to celebrate and extol sectaries and schismatics, who have broken off from her communion ; who maintain doctrines and usages at variance with hers, and who ordain (without an atom of authority of any kind) Priests and Bishops to perpetuate their schism. Now this you are conscious of having recently done in your two volumes of *The Life of John Wesley*, in which also, you afford too strong proofs of your chiming with that fanatic on his fundamental principle of justification. You have constant evidence before your eyes of the conquests which the Methodists, who are the Puritans of the present times, are making of your people by thousands and myriads in every part of the British dominions, to the evident danger of leaving your Cathedrals and Parish Churches empty : yet you aid them in their attempt, as far as lies in your power. Lastly, I hesitate not to warn you, Sir, of what your most clear-sighted politicians and divines are now fully sensible, namely, of the fatal consequences to be expected, both to Religion and the State, from forcing the Sacred Writings into the hands of the young and the ignorant, without comment or oral instruction. For is there a man so blindly bigotted as to believe that

any such person will collect the Thirty-nine Articles, or any other system of Religion whatever, from the mere perusal of the Bible? or that he will learn a sacred regard for truth from the mere scriptural account of Abraham and Jacob, or of mercy from the wars of Joshua, or of chastity from the history of David and Solomon? I mean without a comment, or an interpreter. Is there not danger that he may draw from this unaided lecture, as so many others have done, an approval of the opposite vices, and particularly those of presumption, impiety, lust, rebellion, and regicide? In fact, Lord Clarendon, Maddox and other writers, as I have mentioned, observe to us, that there was not a folly or a crime, which took place during the Grand Rebellion, which the perpetrators of it did not pretend to justify by texts of Scripture; nor do the advocates of religious instruction by the mere Bible, take up so absurd a system, at the present day, but from opposition to the Catholic Church, which always has taught, and always must teach, that there is a twofold revelation of God's word, one written, the other unwritten; in other words, Scripture and Tradition. From this twofold Revelation, the Pastors of the Church



fail not to select and deliver to the body of the faithful such portions of God's word as are necessary for their belief and practice, broken, and prepared for their digestions, in her catechisms and oral instructions. The word of God, thus distributed to Catholics, is found to be one and the same in different ages and countries; whereas Protestants, while they read, most inconsistently, the written without paying attention to the unwritten word of God, or to the authority of the Church in the interpretation of either, are found to be at endless variance one with another, and to be *tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine*.—Ephes. iv. 14.

## NOTES.

---

It may seem not only strange, but also treacherous, in a professed defender of the *Established Episcopal Church*, to find fault with the laws which require her Clergy to subscribe to her Articles of Faith, and to receive their Orders from her; to the exclusion of the Conventicle and self-appointed Preachers of the Commonwealth and of Cromwell's reign, as Mr. Southey does in Vol. ii. p. 481 of his *Book of the Church*. This latitudinarian doctrine, however, accords with what he had before taught in his *Life of Wesley*, Vol. ii. p. 2, where he writes: "Wesley displayed his consummate prudence in not requiring any confession of faith from any person, who desired to become a member of his Religion. Hence the door was left open to the *orthodox* of all descriptions, Churchmen, Dissenters, Baptists, Pædobaptists, Presbyterians, Independents, Calvinists, or Arminians. No profession, no sacrifice of any kind was exacted." Hence it is evident that, according to Mr. Southey's theology, all the above-mentioned heterogeneous and contradictory sects may not only be of *one Religion*, but also be all of the *true Religion*, that is, may be *all orthodox*!—This inconsistency, however, is not much greater than in Mr. Southey's pronouncing the panegyric of John Wickliffe, and singing the praises of Wat. Tyler.

*Note to Vol. ii. p. 151, of "The Book of the Church."*

Mr. Southey must greatly have changed his opinion concerning the marriage of the clergy, in case he has any settled opinion of the matter, since he published what follows.—“ London is never without a certain number of popular preachers. I am not now speaking of those who are popular among the Sectarians, or because they introduce sectarian doctrines into the Church; but of that specific character among the regular English clergy, which is here denominated *a popular preacher*.—The popular preacher of London curls his forelock, studies gestures at his looking-glass, takes lessons in his chamber from some stage-player, and displays his white hand and white handkerchief in the pulpit. The discourse is in character with the orator: nothing to rouse a slumbering conscience; nothing to alarm the soul to a sense of its danger; no difficulties expounded to confirm the wavering; no mighty truths enforced, to rejoice the faithful: to look for theology here would be seeking pears from the elm: only a little smooth morality, such as Turk, Jew, or Infidel, may listen to without offence, sparkling with metaphors and similes, and rounded off with a text of scripture, a scrap of poetry, or, better than either, a quotation from Ossian.—These gentlemen have two ends in view: the main one is to make a fortune by marriage, *one of the evils this of a married clergy*. It was formerly a doubt whether the red coat or the black one had the best chance with the ladies; but, since volunteering has made scarlet so common, black carries the day. The customs of England do not exclude the clergyman from any species of amusement; the popular preacher is to be seen at the theatre, and at the horse race, bearing his part at the concert and the ball, making his court to the old ladies at the card-table, and to the young at the harpsichord: and, in this way, if he does but steer clear of any flagitious crime or irregularity—he generally succeeds in finding some widow, or waning spinster, with weightier charms than youth and beauty.”

—*Southey's Espriclla's Letters*, Vol. i. p. 210.

*Final Note.*

The spirit and tendency of the Poët Laureate's Dramatic Poem of Wat Tyler may be judged of by the following extracts from it.

SCENE.—*Blackheath.*

TYLER, HOB, &c.

*Song.*

When Adam delv'd, and Eve span,  
 Who was then the gentleman?  
 Wretched is the infant's lot,  
 Born within the straw-roof'd cot!  
 Be he gen'rous, wise, and brave,  
 He must only be a slave.  
 Drain'd by taxes of his store,  
 Punish'd next for being poor.

While the peasant works, to sleep;  
 What the peasant sows, to reap;  
 Be he villain, be he fool,  
 Still to hold despotic rule;  
 Trampling on his slaves with scorn:—  
 This is to be nobly born!  
 When Adam delv'd, and Eve span,  
 Who was then the gentleman?

HOB.

Curse on these taxes, one succeeds another;  
 Our ministers, panders of a king's will,  
 Drain all our wealth away, waste it in revels.

JACK STRAW.

I only wonder we lay quiet so long.  
 We had always the same strength, and we deserved  
 The ills, we met with, for not using it.

HOB.

Why do we fear those animals call'd Lords?  
Is not my arm as mighty as a Baron's?

JOHN BALL, *the Wickliffite Priest.*

Ye all are equal, Nature made you so;  
Equality is your birth-right. When I gaze  
On the proud palace, and behold one man  
In the blood-purpled robes of royalty,  
Feasting at ease, and lording over millions:  
Then turn me to the hut of poverty,  
And see the wretched labourer, worn with toil,  
Divide his scanty morsel with his infants;  
I sicken, and, indignant at the sight,  
Blush for the patience of humanity!

WAT TYLER.—*King of England!*

Petitioning for pity is most weak,  
THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE ought to demand justice.

JOHN BALL.

———Tell me, Sir Judge,  
What does the Government avail the Peasant?  
Would not he plough his field and sow the corn,  
Aye, and in peace, enjoy the harvest too;  
Would not the sunshine and the dews descend,  
Though neither King nor Parliament existed?

THE END.

1. The first of these is the fact that the majority of the population is of African descent, and that the majority of the population is of African descent.

[illegible]

*[Faint, illegible handwritten notes]*

... ..

... 1911 ...

$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{1}{\rho} \right) = - \frac{1}{\rho^2} \frac{d\rho}{dt}$

...the ... ..

*Journal of Management Inquiry* 18(6)

1. *Chlorophyll a* (Chl *a*) is the primary photosynthetic pigment in most plants and algae. It is a green pigment that absorbs light energy in the blue and red regions of the visible spectrum.

1991-92: 1991-92

*[Faint handwritten text]*

2017年12月17日

1. The first group of people who are not in the labor force are those who are not in the labor force because they are not in the labor force.

1990

3011100 2221100 1000000 2

18. *Chrysomelidae* (18 species)

...the ... ..

... ..

1990年12月15日

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

...the ... ..

*Just published, Price 2s. 6d.*

## **CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION,**

*Proved to be as necessary for the Peace and Prosperity of*  
**IRELAND,**

*As it is imperatively called for by the Principles of Justice, of*  
*Freedom, and of Christian Religion;*

*Addressed to the Right Hon. GEORGE CANNING, one of His Majesty's*  
*Principal Secretaries of State, &c. &c.*

**By HIEROPHILOS.**

*Lately published, Price 6d.*

## **A LETTER FROM M. LAVAL,**

*Formerly Protestant Minister at Condè-sur-Noireau, to the*  
*Members of his former Communion.*

*Translated from the French.*

*Dr. Doyle's Letter to the Marquis of Wellesley.*

*In 8vo. price 2s. 6d.*

## **A VINDICATION**

**OF THE**  
**RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL PRINCIPLES**

**OF THE**  
**IRISH CATHOLICS.**

*By the same Author, in 8vo. Price 3s.*

## **A DEFENCE OF HIS VINDICATION.**

*Price Eighteen Pence,*

## **A LETTER ADDRESSED TO** **JAMES BUNTER, ESQ.**

*On Religious Tracts, and the Ignorance of the English and Irish*  
*Roman Catholics.—By the Rev. R. T.*

*Price Two Shillings,*

A

# LETTER TO FRANCIS JEFFREY, ESQ.

*Editor of the Edinburgh Review,*

on the Evidence in support of a Continuation of Miraculous Powers in the Church; partly intended as an Answer to the Third Article of the 77th Number of said Work, on the Miracles ascribed to PRINCE ALEXANDER HOHENLOHE.

---

*A New Edition, with considerable Emendations,*

OF THE

## END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY,

&c. &c.

By the R. R. DR. J. MILNER.

This Edition will be comprised in 12 double Numbers, at 6d. each; or 24 sheets, at 3d. each.—Should the Work exceed that Number, the Publishers pledge themselves that the overplus shall be given *gratis*. It will be completed by the end of May.

It may be had of Bolland, York; Sharrock, Preston; Heaton, Newcastle; Hippisley, Bath; Mingay, Norwich; Simpson, Wolverhampton; Macnamara, Catholic Chapel, Bristol; Gillow, Liverpool; and of all other Booksellers in the United Kingdom.

*By the same Author,*

*Price, Demy 8vo. 8s. Royal 8vo. 10s. 6d.*

A

## VINDICATION

OF

## THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY,

From the Exceptions of the Rt. Rev. Dr. THOMAS BURGESS, Bishop of St. David's, and the Rev. RICHARD GRIER, A. M. Vicar of Templebodane, and Chaplain to Earl Talbot, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland:

IN LETTERS TO A CATHOLIC CONVERT.

---

*Price Eighteen Pence,*

## ACCUSATION NO VERDICT,

Or a Reply to an Anonymous Pamphlet entitled, "REMARKS ON POPERY," &c.—By the Rev. John Williams.

---

*Just published, Price 4s. 6d.*

The Second Volume of

MRS. HERBERT AND THE VILLAGERS.











Gaylord  
PAMPHLET BINDER  
Syracuse, N. Y.  
Stockton, Calif.

